

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 092

24

EA 002 713

AUTHOR Stecklein, John E.
TITLE A Coordinated Network of Institutional Research Workshops. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO BR-7-0286
PUB DATE Sep 68
GRANT OEG-1-7-070286-3805
NOTE 113p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$5.75
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Research, Data Collection, Enrollment, Facility Case Studies, Financial Policy, *Institutional Research, Student Research, Teaching Load, *Training, *Workshops

ABSTRACT

This report describes and evaluates two 1968 workshops on institutional research held in the South and Midwest. The workshops were designed to provide short-term intensive training in the problems and techniques of selected areas of institutional research and to allow discussions of the various philosophies of operating institutional research units. Participants were limited to individuals recently assigned responsibility for institutional research in their institutions, or who had been designed to assume such responsibilities in the near future. Materials used during the workshop sessions are included. (MF)

BR-7-0286
PA-24
BR 7-0286
PA24 OE/BR

ED035092

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 7-0286
Grant No. OEG-1-7-070286-3805

A COORDINATED NETWORK OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH WORKSHOPS

September, 1968

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

EA 002 713

ED035092

A COORDINATED NETWORK OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH WORKSHOPS

Project No. 7-0286
Grant No. OEG-1-7-070286-3805

Dr. John E. Stecklein, Director

September, 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

University of Minnesota
Serving as Coordinating Agency
for the
Association for Institutional Research
Southern Regional Education Board and
Institutional Research Council of Eleven

Minneapolis, Minnesota

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iv
Introduction	1
Rationale of the Workshop	2
Description of the Workshop	3
Sites and Duration	3
Staffing	3
Selection of Participants	4
Roster of Participants	5
Topics and Workshop Schedules	9
Questions for Discussion	16
Evaluation	19
Participants' Evaluations	19
Evaluation Form - Exhibit D-1	20
Evaluation Tables - Exhibit D-2	
Follow-up Evaluation of Southern Workshop	34
Director's Evaluation	38
Workshop Materials	39
Announcements and Forms	(Unnumbered)
Student Studies	(Unnumbered)
Curriculum	(Unnumbered)
Fiscal Analysis	(Unnumbered)
Enrollments	(Unnumbered)
Facilities	(Unnumbered)
Faculty Load Studies	(Unnumbered)

Workshop Materials (Continued)	39
Integrated Data System.	(Unnumbered)
Miscellaneous Papers Provided Or Distributed By Guest Lecturers.	(Unnumbered)
Financial Summary	40

Acknowledgements

Grateful appreciation is expressed to the Executive Committee of the Association for Institutional Research for their support in the development and conduct of this project. Special thanks go to the members of this group who served as a special advisory committee for the workshops.

Acknowledgment is due L.J. Lins for work over and beyond that required from him in his role as generalist for the Midwest Workshop. His help in the selection of participants, and in assisting with preliminary arrangements when the Director was unexpectedly asked to take an assignment in Concepcion, Chile is much appreciated. His assistance with the analysis of the evaluation was also most helpful.

Also very much appreciated is the untiring efforts of Miss Dorolese Wardwell. She carried out a myriad of details from the time of receiving the announcement of the grant to support the workshops, supervised the preparation of materials for both workshops, and supervised the preparation of this final report, made more difficult due to problems of communications and transmission between Minneapolis, Minnesota and Concepcion, Chile.

Gratitude is also expressed to Dean Harry Foreman, Associate Dean of the Office of International Programs, for making it possible for the Director to return to Minneapolis from Chile to conduct the Midwest workshop.

John E. Stecklein

Introduction

The interest of college and university administrators in institutional research has increased continually over the past decade. During this period the number of offices of institutional research or institutional studies has increased from less than 20 to over 250; more are being created each year. This new development has increased the demand far beyond the supply available for people trained in or knowledgeable about institutional self-study.

The Association for Institutional Research, aware of the critical shortage of trained personnel -- amply evident from the continuing arrival of letters requesting nominations of people qualified to serve as directors of such units -- decided that it should sponsor a training program to help alleviate the shortage. Plans were made therefore to request financial assistance from the United States Office of Education to make possible a network of four workshops on institutional research -- one in the east, one in the south, one in the west, and one in the upper midwest. Dr. John E. Stecklein, Director of Institutional Research at the University of Minnesota and Past-president of the Association for Institutional Research, was selected to develop the proposal and direct the network if funds were received. From the start it was the intention of the Association to work closely with four regional organizations for higher education (all of which had earlier attempted to strengthen institutional research capabilities in their regions) in the development and conduct of the proposed workshops. Thus, key administrators in four regional units were involved in early discussions of the network proposal -- the Southern Regional Education Board, the Western Interstate Compact for Higher Education, the New England Board for Higher Education, and the Committee on Inter-institutional Cooperation (operationally through its informal subsidiary, the Institutional Research Council of Eleven).

Governmental financial stringencies forced cut-backs in the funds available to the USOE, and funds were obtained only for two of the proposed four workshops. Because the location of workshops in the south and in the midwest would minimize costs, the two workshops were planned for the region served by the Southern Regional Education Board, (15 states bounded by Oklahoma, Texas, Kentucky, Maryland, the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico) and a 12 Midwestern state area. Final word that the funds were available for the workshops was received on May 18, 1967. An Advisory committee of the Association consisting of James Montgomery (President, Emeritus, University of Tennessee), Joseph Saupe (Vice-President, Michigan State University), and Thomas Mann (Representative-at-large, University of Rochester), was set up to work with the Director.

Rationale of the Workshops

The workshops were designed to provide short-term intensive training in the problems and techniques of selected areas of institutional research, complemented by discussions of the various philosophies of operating institutional research units. Instead of the usual passive listen-to-lecture pattern, the workshop participants were given actual data, background information, or special problems to work on -- individually, in twos or threes, or in small groups -- which would give them actual experience in the various steps involved in research projects dealing with college or university operation. Such steps included the general research outline, the clarification of definitions, identification of types of data to be collected and their sources, development of forms for data collection and analysis, and specification of the audience for whom the report was to be written. Working with others and the staff provided a forum for determining the extent to which other people in similar sizes and types of institutions disagreed with decisions on each aspect of the research steps. In carrying out the exercises emphasis was upon doing, and learning while doing from the experts who staffed the sessions as well as from other participants. Because of the type of instruction and to maximize the student staff contact, the number of participants was limited to 30.

The form of presentation varied among the instructors; some lectured briefly to set the stage for their exercises, others plunged the group immediately into the problems developed especially for the workshops, and others utilized demonstration or discussion techniques for the group as a whole.

The two workshops were designed to utilize a single staff, in order to replicate the teacher-designed experiences and content as much as possible. To test the relative advantages, one workshop was scheduled during the winter -- during a school term -- while the second was scheduled for the summer vacation period. The Workshops were designed to last 11 days, with two days to be devoted to each of five major areas of institutional research. Invited lecturers were brought in to deal in more traditional fashion with other topics. Sunday was a breathing spell mid-way in the workshop. The five topics were research on students, research on curriculum, research on faculty, financial analysis, and data collection and management. Topics for invited lecturers included the relationship of institutional research to activities of coordinating boards, evaluation of institutional research, philosophy of institutional research, and space needs and facility planning. Staff members were encouraged to develop homework assignments for workshop participants, but not all made such assignments. Special library materials were brought in and put on display for use by the participants; many evenings were spent reading such materials. The names of the staff members, invited

lecturers, and their areas of responsibility are listed on the attached calendars for each of the workshops, so will not be detailed here.

Description of the Workshops

Sites and Duration -- To provide additional information that might be useful in planning subsequent workshops, two types of living-studying arrangements were used in the two workshops. The Southern Workshop, held the end of January, was located in Pleasant Hall, the Continuation Center of the Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. All housing and study rooms were located in the Center, while eating arrangements were provided by the student union.

Thus this workshop had the collegiate atmosphere of a campus, with university-type social activities available. The Midwest Workshop was held the end of June in Minneapolis, Minnesota. However, to provide a different type of environment, the workshop was held in a motel that provided all living, eating, and studying facilities, plus a swimming pool. Other social activities were available in the city of Minneapolis -- 5 miles distant. In both situations, workshop participants were encouraged to become well-acquainted and to discuss their own problems as well as those presented in the workshop during after hours, while eating, swimming, etc.

The dates of the Workshops were January 28 through February 8, 1968, for the Southern Workshop, and June 23 through July 3, 1968 for the Midwest Workshop.

Staffing -- Four of the five major staff members were common to both workshops. The fifth member in each case was a generalist who represented the regional group involved. For the Southern Workshop, the Director of Research of the SREB, Dr. E.F. Schietinger, served as generalist and was responsible for planning one major session of the workshop. As generalist, he remained throughout the entire workshop for informal discussion and contact as well as the formal responsibilities which he carried. The generalist for the Midwest Workshop was Dr. L.J. Lins, Director of Research for the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in Wisconsin (on leave from his position as Coordinator of Institutional Studies at the University of Wisconsin). The director of the Workshop program also served as generalist and led special sessions for both workshops. The other major staff members were Dr. James R. Montgomery, Director of Institutional Research, University of Tennessee, Dr. Joseph L. Saupe, Associate Director of Institutional Research, Michigan State University, and Dr. Paul Jedamus, Director of Institutional Research, University of Colorado. Each staff member had many years of experience in his special area.

Selection of Participants -- In the Southern Workshop, the announcement of the workshops, the receipt of applications, and the selection of participants was handled by the Southern Regional Education Board, under the direction of the Generalist staff member of the workshop. The basic group from which selections were made was a list of people who had previously indicated interest in institutional research workshops conducted in the past by the Regional Board, but who had not been selected to attend. Participation was limited to individuals who recently within the past year had been assigned responsibility for institutional research in their institutions, or who had been designated to assume such responsibilities in the near future. Thus the participants represented newcomers to the field, persons who had had no previous training in institutional research. Thirty participants were selected from 44 applicants and 28 actually attended.

In the Midwest Workshop, announcements went to all colleges and universities in 12 midwest states, including the states represented by the Institutional Research Council of Eleven (IRCE). Applications were received at the Director's office, and selection of participants was made by the two generalists, subsequent to agreement by the Advisory Committees of the AIR and of the IRCE that the Midwest Workshop should be open to midwestern states also that were not members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation. Thus applications were received from North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri, in addition to the seven states in which the CIC institutions were located. Again the criteria included recent assignment to direct institutional research activities, little or no experience in the field (less than 1 year), and an attempt to realize a good distribution of sizes and types of institution and states. Because of the experience of the Southern Workshop, in which fewer than 30 participants actually showed up, 33 participants were selected for the Midwest Workshop from 40 applications. Thirty-one actually attended.

Rosters of the participants, with institutions and titles for each workshop, are presented below:

Exhibit A

ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS
Southern Workshop on Institutional Research
L.S.U., January 28-February 8, 1968

Dr. Richard Arrington, Jr.
Dean of the College
Miles College
Birmingham, Alabama 35208

Dr. Leon H. Belcher
Director, Bureau of Testing
and Research
Texas Southern University
3201 Wheeler Avenue
Houston, Texas 77004

Dr. Harry L. Bowman
Director, Academic Computer Center
Northeast Louisiana State College
4001 SeSiard Rd.
Monroe, Louisiana 71201

Dr. Charles L. Darby
Assistant Vice President
for Instruction
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

Dr. B.G. Dunn, Director
Institutional Research
Fairmont State College
Locust Avenue
Fairmont, West Virginia 26554

Dr. Erby C. Fischer
Assistant Professor of Education
Livingston State College
P.O. Box 787
Livingston, Alabama 35470

Mr. Nelson Garrison
Coordinator
Student Personnel Research
North Carolina State University
115 Peale Hall
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Mr. Vance E. Gray
Director, Institutional Research
North Carolina Agricultural and
Technical State University
312 N. Dudley Street
Greensboro, North Carolina 27411

Dr. William R. Hicks
Chairman of Secondary Education
Southern University
P.O. Box 9273, Southern
University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70813

Dr. Richard A. Hunt
Director of Institutional
Research
Southern Methodist University
Room 103, Clements Hall
Dallas, Texas 75222

Dr. S.T. Keim, Jr.
Vice President for Academic
Affairs
University of Texas at Arlington
West St. at Third
Arlington, Texas 76010

Dr. Emmett Kohler
Director, Institutional Research
and Bureau of Educational
Research
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi 38762

Mr. Robert M. Krisko
Director of Institutional Studies
University of North Carolina
at Greensboro
1411 Spring Garden
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412

ROSTER - Continued

Dr. Robert C. Lehman
Professor of Physical Science
Eastern Mennonite College
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22801

Dr. Francis A. Lonsway
Co-Director for Merger
Bellarmine and Usuline Colleges
2000 Norris Place
Louisville, Kentucky 40205

Dr. Harlan L. McMillan
Coordinator of Research
The College of the Ozarks
Clarksville, Arkansas 72830

Mr. Jeff Norris
Director of Development
Lenoir-Rhyne College
Hickory, North Carolina 28601

Mr. Ted Pfeifer
Registrar
Loyola University
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

Mr. Robert E. Phillips
Director of Admissions
High Point College
High Point, North Carolina 27262

Dr. G.R. Ragland
Registrar
Prairie View A & M College
Prairie View, Texas 77445

Dr. Daniel M. Seifer, Director
Office of Program Planning
and Budgeting
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee Institute, Alabama 36088

Mr. C.H. Sheffey
Registrar and Director of
Institutional Research
Marymount College
Military Trail
Boca Raton, Florida 33432

Sister Jerome Nossell, Ph.D.
Director of Institutional
Research
Saint Joseph College
Emmitsburg, Maryland 21727

Sister Virginia Clara Duncan,
C.D.P.
Director of Institutional
Research
Our Lady of the Lake College
411 S.W. 24th Street
San Antonio, Texas 78207

Mr. Dean R. Strenger, Director
of Institutional Research and
Mathematics Instructor
St. Gregory's College
Shawnee, Oklahoma 74801

Dr. Joseph T. Sutton, Director
Institutional Research
University of Alabama
Box 5475
University, Alabama 35486

Dr. Alton L. Taylor
Assistant Professor of Education
Office of Institutional Analysis
1-B West Range
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Dr. Fred J. Taylor, Director
of Institutional Research
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

Dr. James A. Wash, Jr.
Associate Professor of Psychology
West Georgia College
Carrollton, Georgia 30117

Mr. Woodrow Z. Wilson
Director for Institutional
Research
Benedict College
Harden Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29204

MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

I
R
C
E

University of Minnesota (June 23-July 3, 1968)
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Roster of Participants

Mr. Louis F. Chenette
Assistant Dean of the College
Findlay College
Findlay, Ohio 45840

Dr. Robert W. Clyde
Director, Social Science
Research Center
Augsburg College
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404

Mr. Roger F. Combs
Director, Office of Institutional
Research
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Dr. William W. Converse
Coordinator of Data Systems
and Institutional Studies
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44240

Miss Marie A. Corrigan
Psychology Department
College of St. Catherine
St. Paul, Minnesota 55116

Mr. Arthur J. Elbert
Act. Dir. Institutional Research
Chicago State College
Chicago, Illinois 60621

Dr. Paul J. Heideman
Dir. Institutional Research
Concordia College
St. Paul, Minnesota 55104

Mr. Lowell H. Hildebrand
Dir. Institutional Research
Concordia College
St. Paul, Minnesota 55104

Mr. David L. Ingall
Research Associate
Northern Michigan University
Marquette, Michigan 49885

Mr. C. Thomas Innis
Assistant to the Director of
Institutional Studies
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

Mr. Larry G. Jones
Director, Institutional Research
Wittenberg University
Springfield, Ohio 45501

Mr. W.E. Koenker
Vice President for Academic
Affairs
University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201

William L. Pickett Jr.
Acting Director of Admissions and
Assistant for Special Resources
Rockhurst College
Kansas City, Missouri 64110

Dr. Roland Reboussin
College Examiner
Beloit College
Beloit, Wisconsin 53511

Roster of Participants (continued)

Dr. Howard Rose
Dean of Academic Affairs
St. Olaf College
Northfield, Minnesota 55057

Dr. Martin Desmond Ryan
Director, Institutional Research
Saint Joseph's College
Rensselaer, Indiana 47978

Mr. John T. St. Martin
Comptroller
College of St. Thomas
St. Paul, Minnesota

Dr. W.J. Sandness
Director Institutional Research
Kansas State College of
Pittsburgh
Pittsburg, Kansas 66762

Mr. Dale C. Schatz
Director of Research
Jefferson College
Hillsboro, Missouri 63050

Mr. Arthur J. Schulz
Academic Dean
Dr. Martin Luther College
New Ulm, Minnesota 56073

Sister Mary Vernic Makovic,
S.N.D.
Academic Dean
Notre Dame College
Cleveland, Ohio 44121

Mr. J. Leland Skaggs
Director, Institutional Studies
Milton College
Milton, Wisconsin 53563

Mr. Louis Smith
Associate Dean of Academic
Affairs
Simpson College
Indianola, Iowa 50125

Dr. Wesley S. Sommers
Special Assistant to the President
Stout State University
Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751

Dr. Casey A. Tucker
Coordinator, Institutional
Studies
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana 47306

Dr. William V. Tucker
Academic Dean
Briar Cliff College
Sioux City, Iowa 51104

Mr. William J. Van Cleve
Dean of Student Affairs
St. John's University
Collegeville, Minnesota 56321

Dr. Peter Veltman
Dean, Wheaton College
Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois 60187

Dr. Arlan Viste
Department of Chemistry
Augustana College
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57102

Dr. Keith Wharton
Research Associate
Bureau of Institutional Research
University of Minnesota
9 Clarence Avenue South East
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

Mr. Craig D. Willis
Registrar
Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware, Ohio 43015

Topics and Workshop Schedules -- As indicated previously, the topics common to both workshops were research on students, research on curriculum, and research on faculty. A fourth area in each workshop dealt with data collection, and management, but the approaches to the fifth topic were quite different in the two workshops as the session titles indicate on the following workshop schedules:

Exhibit B

Southern Workshop on Institutional Research
Southern Regional Education Board
Association for Institutional Research
Louisiana State University
(January 28-February 8, 1968)

Sunday, January 28

2:00 - 6:00 p.m.	Registration (Pleasant Hall)
6:00 - 7:00 p.m.	Reception (Bob and Jake's Supper Club)
7:00 - 9:00 p.m.	Dinner (Bob and Jake's Supper Club)
	Institutional Research in Perspective--John E. Stecklein
	Vice President (LSU) Welcome
	(Remaining sessions at Pleasant Hall)

Monday, January 29

8:30 a.m. - 9:00	Orientation (SREB Welcome) (John E. Stecklein)
9:00 a.m. - 10:30	Student Studies -- James Montgomery
10:45 a.m. - 12:15	"
1:30 p.m. - 3:00	"
3:30 p.m. - 5:00	"

Tuesday, January 30

8:45 a.m. - 10:15	Student Studies
10:45 a.m. - 12:15	"
1:30 p.m. - 3:00	"
3:30 p.m. - 5:00	"
7:30 p.m. - 9:30	Space Utilization -- James W. Firnberg

Wednesday, January 31

8:45 a.m. - 10:15	Curriculum Studies -- Joseph L. Saupe
10:45 a.m. - 12:15	"
12:15 p.m. - 1:30	Luncheon, AIR Welcome -- Leroy Hull
1:45 p.m. - 3:15	Curriculum Studies
3:45 p.m. - 5:15	"

Thursday, February 1

8:45 a.m. - 10:15	Curriculum Studies
10:45 a.m. - 12:15	"
1:30 p.m. - 3:00	"
3:30 p.m. - 5:00	"

Exhibit B

Friday, February 2

8:45 a.m. - 10:15	Fiscal Analysis -- Paul Jedamus
10:45 a.m. - 12:15	"
1:30 p.m. - 3:00	"
3:45 p.m. - 5:15	"
7:30 p.m. - 9:00	"

Saturday, February 3

8:30 a.m. - 10:15	Fiscal Analysis
10:30 a.m. - 12:30	"
AFTERNOON OFF	

Sunday, February 4

NOTHING SCHEDULED

Monday, February 5

8:45 a.m. - 10:15	Faculty Studies -- John E. Stecklein
10:45 a.m. - 12:15	"
1:30 p.m. - 3:00	"
3:30 p.m. - 5:00	"
7:30 p.m. - 9:00	Institutional Research and State-Wide Coordination -- John Coffelt

Tuesday, February 6

8:45 a.m. - 10:15	Faculty Studies
10:45 a.m. - 12:15	"
1:30 p.m. - 3:00	Data Systems: Design and Utilization - E.F. Schietinger, John W. Hamblen and Kenneth M. Wilson
3:30 p.m. - 5:00	"

Wednesday, February 7

8:45 a.m. - 10:15	Data Systems: Design and Utilization
10:45 a.m. - 12:15	"
12:30 p.m. - 1:30	Luncheon
1:30 p.m. - 3:00	Data Systems: Design Utilization
3:30 p.m. - 5:00	"

Thursday, February 8

8:45 a.m. - 10:15	Data Systems: Design and Utilization
10:45 a.m. - 12:15	Workshop Wrap-up

MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
University of Minnesota (June 23-July 3, 1968)
Minneapolis, Minnesota

I
R
C
E

PLACE: AMBASSADOR MOTOR HOTEL
5225 WAYZATA BOULEVARD
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 54426

(All meetings will be held at the Ambassador Motor Hotel)

Program Schedule

Sunday, June 23

2:00 p.m. - 6:00	Registration
5:00 p.m. - 6:00	Reception (Albert Room)
	(Remaining sessions in the Envoy Room)

Monday, June 24 (Envoy Room)

8:30 a.m. - 9:00	Orientation -- John E. Stecklein Director, Bureau of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota
9:00 a.m. - 10:30	Student Studies -- James Montgomery Director, Office of Institutional Research, University of Tennessee
10:45 a.m. - 12:15	Student Studies
1:30 p.m. - 3:00	Student Studies
3:30 p.m. - 5:00	Student Studies
7:00 p.m. - 9:00	Dinner Address by Ruth E. Eckert, Professor of Higher Education, University of Minnesota Albert Room "Institutional Research--An Appraisal and Projection"

Tuesday, June 25 (Envoy Room)

8:45 a.m. - 10:15	Student Studies
10:45 a.m. - 12:15	Student Studies
1:30 p.m. - 3:00	Curriculum Studies -- Joseph L. Saupe, Associate Director, Office of Institu- tional Research, Michigan State University
3:30 p.m. - 5:00	Curriculum Studies

Exhibit B-1

Wednesday, June 26

8:45 a.m. - 10:15
10:45 a.m. - 12:15
1:30 p.m. - 3:00
3:30 p.m. - 5:00

Curriculum Studies
Curriculum Studies
Curriculum Studies
Curriculum Studies

Thursday, June 27

8:45 a.m. - 10:15

10:45 a.m. - 12:00
12:15 p.m. - 1:30

1:45 p.m. - 3:15
3:45 p.m. - 5:15

Fiscal Analysis -- Paul Jedamus,
Director, Office of Institutional
Research, University of Colorado
Fiscal Analysis
Luncheon - AIR Welcome -- Joseph L. Saupe,
(Boreas Room) President
Fiscal Analysis
Fiscal Analysis

Friday, June 28

8:45 a.m. - 10:15
10:45 a.m. - 12:15
1:30 p.m. - 3:00

3:30 p.m. - 5:00

Fiscal Analysis
Fiscal Analysis
Enrollment Estimate and Projection
Techniques -- L.J. Lins, Director of
Research, Wisconsin Coordinating
Council for Higher Education
Enrollment Estimate and Projection
Techniques

Saturday, June 29

8:30 a.m. - 10:15

10:30 a.m. - 12:30
AFTERNOON OFF

Space Needs and Facility Planning --
Frederick E. Schweher, Associate
Director for Facilities, Wisconsin
Coordinating Council for Higher
Education
Space Needs and Facility Planning

Sunday, June 30

NOTHING SCHEDULED

Monday, July 1

8:45 a.m. - 10:15
10:45 a.m. - 12:15
1:30 p.m. - 3:00

Faculty Studies -- John E. Stecklein
Faculty Studies
Faculty Studies

Exhibit B-1

3:30 p.m. - 5:00
7:30 p.m. - 9:00

Faculty Studies
Institutional Research and State-Wide
Coordination -- Dan S. Hobbs,
Educational Programs Officer,
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher
Education

Tuesday, July 2

8:45 a.m. - 10:15
10:45 a.m. - 12:15
1:30 p.m. - 3:00
3:30 p.m. - 5:00

Faculty Studies
Faculty Studies
Integrated Data Systems -- L.J. Lins
Integrated Data Systems

Wednesday, July 3

8:45 a.m. - 10:15
10:45 a.m. - 12:15
12:30 p.m. - 1:30

1:30 p.m.

Integrated Data Systems
Integrated Data Systems
Luncheon - Workshop Wrap-up --
John E. Stecklein
(Albert Room)
End of Workshop

In order to provide direction to the staff of the respective workshops, the selected participants, prior to the workshop, were asked to submit areas and questions of particular concern. The resultant questions for discussion at the Midwest Workshop follow:

MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. The place of Institutional Research in the institutional structure.
 - a. To whom should the office be responsible? What is staff authority of office?
 - b. Specific illustrations and accompanying rationale for expanding and justifying this function where it has historically been minimized and relegated to a minor role.
 - c. What should constitute continuing institutional research projects?
 - d. How can the results of institutional research be used in more effective planning?
 - e. How can research support recruitment and enrollment functions?
 - f. Should Data Processing report to Institutional Research?
2. The role of the Institutional Research office in determination of institutional policy.
 - a. How can the office become more effective in shaping institutional policy?
 - b. Should not institutional research personnel be voting members on major policy-making committees?
 - c. How well are results of studies and recommendations made by Institutional Research offices accepted and implemented?
3. Coordination of Institutional Research projects with faculty.
 - a. Suggested methodology and format for collecting and reporting.
 - b. What are the most effective procedures for coordinating Institutional Research projects with faculty?
 - c. Procedure when faculty initiated? Procedure when initiated by Institutional Research office?

4. Communication of Institutional Research findings.
 - a. Discussion of design and analysis methods and practices.
 - b. What are the procedures for communication?
 - c. Is there an effective way of sharing "internal consumption" information with other institutional research offices? Who should establish the policy?
5. Financing of Institutional Research.
 - a. How much is necessary beyond salaries?
 - b. Sources of funds (private and governmental) and basis and method of application for each. Do Institutional Research offices join together to obtain financial support? Are small colleges working with larger institutions?
6. Staffing of Institutional Research office.
 - a. Can head be a part-time position? What staff is needed for a small college?
 - b. Qualifications of director? How many of present directors meet these specifications? What type of background and experience do schools look for in recruiting staff?
 - c. What professional/clerical ratio should there be? How many of each in a small (or large) institution?
7. Institutional Research in the small institutions.
 - a. How does it get started? In what areas first?
 - b. What are the areas of research concerned in meeting the objectives of the college?
8. The nature of Institutional Research.
 - a. Examples of studies to be of worth and importance.
 - b. Is there any clear definition of the function of an Institutional Research office?
 - c. Should Institutional Research confine itself to data collection?
9. The collection of institutional data.
 - a. Examples of instruments used in other institutions and methodologies employed.

- b. What are procedures for a newly established community college?
- c. What kinds of data banks exist?
- d. What authority does Institutional Research office have in requesting and collecting data from different departments?
- e. How filed for best use?

10. Other.

- a. What can be done in simulation and model building?
- b. "Refresher" in statistics and statistical procedures.
- c. What national assistance is available to a new office of Institutional Research?

Evaluation

Participants' Evaluations -- At the end of each workshop, each participant was asked to complete an evaluation form, and to supply any other comments, criticisms, or suggestions that might be useful in planning future workshops. Responses were received from all but two of the participants in the Southern Workshop, and from all participants in the Midwest Workshop. A sample copy of the evaluation form for the Midwest Workshop follows with a summary of responses on the checklist sections, and a summarization of the free response reactions. Responses were grouped according to type and size of individual's home institution - public or private, total enrollment 8000 and under or over 8000.

MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
JUNE 23 - JULY 3, 1968

EVALUATION FORM

The purpose of this form is to give workshop participants an opportunity to convey to the workshop staff their reactions to and constructive criticism of the workshop, its format, content, schedule, staffing, etc. Such thoughtful appraisals are important to the assessment of the rationale underlying the development of this workshop, and in designing and conducting subsequent workshops. We therefore urge you to be candid in your responses. Please return the completed form on or before July 3.

1. a. Please indicate your overall rating of each of the major units of the workshop, by checking the appropriate boxes below. Please rate the "presentation and/or discussion" and the "exercises" separately.

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Of Little Help	Of No Help
Student Studies:				
Presentation and/or Discussion				
Exercises				
Curriculum Studies:				
Presentation and/or Discussion				
Exercises				
Fiscal Analysis:				
Presentation and/or Discussion				
Exercises				
Enrollment Estimate & Projections:				
Presentation and/or Discussion				
Exercises				
Space Needs & Facility Planning:				
Presentation and/or Discussion				
Exercises				
Faculty Studies:				
Presentation and/or Discussion				
Exercises				
Integrated Data Systems:				
Presentation and/or Discussion				
Exercises				
Special Lectures at:				
Dinner, June 24				
Evening, July 1				

- b. If you checked "of little help" or "of no help" for any of the items, please indicate what you think might have been done to make them more helpful to you.

2. What is your general reaction to the "Exercise" approach for a workshop as compared to the straight lecture or lecture-question and answer method?

3. Please rate the following aspects of the workshop by checking the appropriate boxes:

total length of workshop (10 days)
 number of topics covered (7)
 length of individual sessions (1-1/2 hours)
 frequency of coffee breaks (2/day)
 frequency of formal dinners and luncheons (3)
 number of assignments to participants
 feedback from participants to staff
 feedback from staff to participants
 opportunity to discuss material with staff
 number of participants (30)
 number of special lecturers (2)
 amount of free time
 proportion of time devoted to exercises
 costs to participants or institutions

Excessive	About Right	Insufficient

4. Please use the space below for any additional comments or suggestions about the workshop.

5. Data for analysis of evaluations:

College with enrollment < 500
 College with enrollment < 1000
 College with enrollment 1001-3000
 College with enrollment 3001-8000
 College with enrollment > 8000

Type of control: public _____
 private _____

Experience in Institutional Research: Completely new to the field _____
 Had some previous experience _____

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SOUTHERN WORKSHOP

I. Overall Rating of Major Units

Unit	Very Helpful	Helpful	Of Little Help	Of No Help
Student Studies:				
Presentation and/or Discussion	13	10	--	--
Exercises	10	9	4	--
Curriculum Studies:				
Presentation and/or Discussion	6	16	2	--
Exercises	3	16	5	--
Fiscal Analysis:				
Presentation and/or Discussion	11	10	1	--
Exercises	6	13	1	--
Faculty Studies:				
Presentation and/or Discussion	21	3	--	--
Exercises	12	10	--	--
Data Systems (First Series):				
Presentation and/or Discussion	6	5	1	--
Exercises	2	6	2	1
Data Systems (Second Series):				
Presentation and/or Discussion	1	4	7	--
Exercises	1	5	4	1
TOTAL	92	107	27	2

Part II. (Continued)

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SOUTHERN WORKSHOP

II. Specific Aspects of Workshop

Aspect	Excessive	About Right	Insuffi- cient
Total length of workshop (11 days)	14	10	--
Number of topics covered (5)	5	20	--
Length of individual Sessions (1 1/2 hours)	2	22	--
Frequency of coffee breaks (s/day)	--	25	--
Frequency of formal dinners and luncheons (3)	--	22	3
Number of assignments to participants	3	21	1
Feedback from participants to staff	--	25	--
Feedback from staff to participants	--	18	7
Opportunity to discuss material with staff	--	23	2
Number of participants (30)	--	25	--
Number of special lecturers (4)	--	25	--
Amount of free time	1	22	2
Proportion of time devoted to exercises	9	12	3
TOTAL	34	270	18

The experience of the Southern Workshop was used in planning the Midwest Workshop, as noted in the changes between the two programs. The analysis of the participants' evaluations of the Midwest Workshop follows:

EVALUATION OF MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

TABLE IA

OVERALL RATING OF MAJOR UNITS OF WORKSHOP
TOTAL PUBLIC AND PRIVATE

Major Unit	Number					Per Cent			
	VH	H	OLH	ONH	Total	VH	H	OLH	ONH
Student Studies									
Presentation	9	20	1	1	31	29.0	64.5	3.2	3.2
Exercises	5	21	4	--	30	16.7	70.0	13.3	--
Curriculum Studies									
Presentation	4	20	7	--	31	12.9	64.5	22.6	--
Exercises	8	17	5	--	30	26.7	56.7	16.7	--
Fiscal Analysis									
Presentation	13	14	2	1	30	43.3	46.7	6.7	3.3
Exercises	7	14	5	--	26	26.9	53.8	19.2	--
Enroll. Projections									
Presentation	7	17	7	--	31	22.6	54.8	22.6	--
Exercises	4	18	7	--	29	13.8	62.1	24.1	--
Facilities									
Presentation	6	15	5	3	29	20.7	51.7	17.2	10.3
Faculty									
Presentation	15	10	2	1	28	53.6	35.7	7.1	3.6
Exercises	9	11	8	--	28	32.1	39.3	28.6	--
Integrated Data									
Presentation	6	17	6	1	30	20.0	56.7	20.0	3.3
Exercises	2	12	7	4	25	8.0	48.0	28.0	16.0
Special Lectures									
Dinner June 24	2	13	11	4	30	6.7	43.3	36.7	13.3
Dinner July 1	10	13	4	--	27	37.0	48.1	14.8	--

Note: VH - Very helpful; H - Helpful; OLH - Of little help;
ONH - Of no help.

EVALUATION OF MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

TABLE 1B

OVERALL RATING OF MAJOR UNITS OF WORKSHOP TOTAL PUBLIC AND TOTAL PRIVATE

Major Unit	Total Public					Total Private				
	Per Cent					Per Cent				
	VH	H	OLH	ONH	N	VH	H	OLH	ONH	N
Student Studies										
Presentation	33.3	66.7	--	--	12	26.3	63.2	5.3	5.3	19
Exercises	16.7	66.7	16.7	--	12	16.7	72.2	11.1	--	18
Curriculum Studies										
Presentation	33.3	66.7	--	--	12	--	63.2	36.8	--	19
Exercises	33.3	50.0	16.7	--	12	22.2	61.1	16.7	--	18
Fiscal Analysis										
Presentation	45.5	54.5	--	--	11	42.1	42.1	10.5	5.3	19
Exercises	22.2	55.6	22.2	--	9	29.4	52.9	17.6	--	17
Enroll. Projections										
Presentation	25.0	75.0	--	--	12	21.1	42.1	36.8	--	19
Exercises	27.3	63.6	9.1	--	11	5.6	61.1	33.3	--	18
Facilities										
Presentation	18.2	72.9	9.1	--	11	22.2	38.9	22.2	16.7	18
Faculty										
Presentation	81.8	18.2	--	--	11	35.3	47.1	11.8	5.9	17
Exercises	45.5	36.4	18.2	--	11	23.5	41.2	35.3	--	17
Integrated Data										
Presentation	33.3	58.3	8.3	--	12	11.1	55.6	27.8	5.6	18
Exercises	9.1	45.5	36.4	9.1	11	7.1	50.0	21.4	21.4	14
Special Lectures										
Dinner June 24	8.3	50.0	41.7	--	12	5.6	38.9	33.3	22.2	18
Dinner July 1	27.3	45.5	27.3	--	11	43.8	50.0	6.2	--	16

Note: VH - Very helpful; H - Helpful; OLH - Of little help; ONH - Of no help; N - Number

EVALUATION OF MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

TABLE IC

OVERALL RATING OF MAJOR UNITS OF WORKSHOP
PUBLIC ACCORDING TO SIZE OF INSTITUTION

Major Unit	8,000 and Under					Over 8,000				
	Per Cent					Per Cent				
	VH	H	OLH	ONH	N	VH	H	OLH	ONH	N
Student Studies										
Presentation	28.6	71.4	--	--	7	40.0	60.0	--	--	5
Exercises	14.3	85.7	--	--	7	20.0	40.0	40.0	--	5
Curriculum Studies										
Presentation	42.9	57.1	--	--	7	20.0	80.0	--	--	5
Exercises	28.6	71.4	--	--	7	40.0	20.0	40.0	--	5
Fiscal Analysis										
Presentation	50.0	50.0	--	--	6	40.0	60.0	--	--	5
Exercises	40.0	40.0	20.0	--	5	--	75.0	25.0	--	4
Enroll. Projections										
Presentation	28.6	71.4	--	--	7	20.0	80.0	--	--	5
Exercises	28.6	57.1	14.3	--	7	20.0	60.0	20.0	--	5
Facilities										
Presentation	33.3	66.7	--	--	6	--	80.0	20.0	--	5
Faculty										
Presentation	83.3	16.7	--	--	6	80.0	20.0	--	--	5
Exercises	50.0	33.3	16.7	--	6	40.0	40.0	20.0	--	5
Integrated Data										
Presentation	28.6	71.4	--	--	7	40.0	40.0	20.0	--	5
Exercises	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	6	--	60.0	40.0	--	5
Special Lectures										
Dinner June 24	14.3	42.9	42.9	--	7	--	60.0	40.0	--	5
Dinner July 1	33.3	33.3	33.3	--	6	20.0	60.0	20.0	--	5

Note: VH - Very helpful; H- Helpful; OLH - Of little help; OHN - Of no help; N - Number

EVALUATION OF MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

TABLE ID

OVERALL RATING OF MAJOR UNITS OF WORKSHOP PRIVATE ACCORDING TO SIZE OF INSTITUTION

Major Unit	1,000 and Under					Over 1,000				
	Per Cent				N	Per Cent				N
	VH	H	OLH	ONH		VH	H	OLH	ONH	
Student Studies										
Presentation	50.0	50.0	--	--	4	20.0	66.7	6.7	6.7	15
Exercises	50.0	50.0	--	--	4	7.1	78.6	14.3	--	14
Curriculum Studies										
Presentation	--	50.0	50.0	--	4	--	66.7	33.3	--	15
Exercises	25.0	75.0	--	--	4	21.4	57.1	21.4	--	14
Fiscal Analysis										
Presentation	50.0	50.0	--	--	4	40.0	40.0	13.3	6.7	15
Exercises	25.0	75.0	--	--	4	30.8	46.1	23.1	--	13
Enroll. Projections										
Presentation	50.0	50.0	--	--	4	13.3	40.0	46.7	--	15
Exercises	25.0	75.0	--	--	4	--	57.1	42.9	--	14
Facilities										
Presentation	50.0	25.0	25.0	--	4	14.3	42.9	21.4	21.4	14
Faculty										
Presentation	25.0	75.0	--	--	4	38.5	38.5	15.4	7.7	13
Exercises	50.0	50.0	--	--	4	15.4	38.5	46.1	--	13
Integrated Data										
Presentation	25.0	75.0	--	--	4	7.1	50.0	35.7	7.1	14
Exercises	33.3	66.7	--	--	3	--	45.5	27.3	27.3	11
Special Lectures										
Dinner June 24	25.0	25.0	50.0	--	4	--	42.9	28.6	28.6	14
Dinner July 1	33.3	66.7	--	--	3	46.1	46.1	7.7	--	13

Note: VH - Very helpful; H - Helpful; OLH - Of little help; ONH - Of no help; N - Number

EVALUATION OF MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

TABLE IE

OVERALL RATING OF MAJOR UNITS OF WORKSHOP
PERSONS WITH LITTLE OR NO EXPERIENCE VS. PERSONS WITH SOME EXPERIENCE
IN INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Major Unit	Little or No Experience					Some Experience				
	Per Cent					Per Cent				
	VH	H	OLH	ONH	N	VH	H	OLH	ONH	N
Student Studies										
Presentation	31.3	56.3	6.2	6.2	16	26.7	73.3	--	--	15
Exercises	12.5	75.0	12.5	--	16	20.0	66.7	13.3	--	15
Curriculum Studies										
Presentation	6.2	68.8	25.0	--	16	20.0	60.0	20.0	--	15
Exercises	26.7	66.7	6.7	--	15	26.7	46.7	26.7	--	15
Fiscal Analysis										
Presentation	43.8	43.8	12.5	--	16	50.0	42.9	--	7.1	14
Exercises	21.4	71.4	7.1	--	14	41.7	25.0	33.3	--	12
Enroll. Projections										
Presentation	25.0	62.5	12.5	--	16	20.0	46.7	33.3	--	15
Exercises	6.7	86.7	6.7	--	15	21.4	35.7	42.9	--	14
Facilities										
Presentation	18.8	62.5	12.5	6.2	16	23.1	61.5	--	15.4	13
Faculty										
Presentation	50.0	35.7	14.3	--	14	57.1	35.7	--	7.1	14
Exercises	28.6	35.7	35.7	--	14	35.7	42.9	21.4	--	14
Integrated Data										
Presentation	18.8	62.5	18.8	--	16	21.4	50.0	21.4	7.1	14
Exercises	--	69.2	23.1	7.7	13	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	12
Special Lectures										
Dinner June 24	--	56.3	25.0	18.8	16	14.3	28.6	50.0	7.1	14
Dinner July 1	38.5	38.5	23.1	--	13	35.7	57.1	7.1	--	14

Note: VH - Very helpful; H - Helpful; OLH - Of little help; ONH - Of no help; N - Number

MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

TABLE IIA

RATING OF SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF WORKSHOP
TOTAL PUBLIC AND PRIVATE

Item	Number				Per Cent		
	Exces- sive	About Right	Insuf- ficient	Total	Exces- sive	About Right	Insuf- ficient
Length of Workshop (10 days)	14	14	1	29	48.3	48.3	3.4
No. of Topics Covered (7)	9	19	--	28	32.1	67.9	--
Length of Individual Sessions (1-1/2 hrs.)	--	30	--	30	--	100.0	--
Frequency of Coffee Breaks (2/day)	1	30	--	31	3.2	96.8	--
Frequency of Formal Din- ners and Luncheons (3)	5	25	--	30	16.7	83.3	--
No. of Assignments to Participants	8	19	3	30	26.7	63.3	10.0
Feedback from Participants to Staff	--	18	11	29	--	62.1	37.9
Feedback from Staff to Participants	--	20	11	31	--	64.5	35.5
Opportunity to Discuss Material with Staff	--	16	10	26	--	61.5	38.5
No. of Participants (30)	--	30	1	31	--	96.8	3.2
No. of Special Lectures (2)	1	20	4	25	4.0	80.0	16.0
Amount of Free Time	4	16	9	29	13.8	55.2	31.0
Time Devoted to Exercises	10	13	6	29	34.4	44.8	20.7
Costs to Participants or Institution	13	16	--	29	44.8	55.2	--

MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

TABLE IIB

RATING OF SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF WORKSHOP TOTAL PUBLIC AND TOTAL PRIVATE

Item	Total Public				Total Private			
	Per Cent			N	Per Cent			N
	Exces- sive	About Right	Insuf- ficient		Exces- sive	About Right	Insuf- ficient	
Length of Workshop (10 days)	70.0	30.0	--	10	36.8	57.9	5.3	19
No. of Topics Covered (7)	27.3	72.7	--	11	35.3	64.7	--	17
Length of Individual Ses- sions (1-1/2 hrs.)	--	100.0	--	12	--	100.0	--	18
Frequency of Coffee Breaks (2/day)	--	100.0	--	12	5.3	94.7	--	19
Frequency of Formal Din- ners and Luncheons (3)	8.3	91.7	--	12	22.2	77.8	--	18
No. of Assignments to Participants	27.3	72.7	--	11	26.3	57.9	15.8	19
Feedback from Partici- pants to Staff	--	54.5	45.5	11	--	66.7	33.3	18
Feedback from Staff to Participants	--	66.7	33.3	12	--	53.2	36.8	19
Opportunity to Discuss Material with Staff	--	66.7	33.3	9	--	58.8	41.2	17
No. of Participants (30)	--	100.0	--	12	--	94.7	5.3	19
No. of Special Lectures (2)	--	80.0	20.0	10	6.7	86.7	6.7	15
Amount of Free Time	20.0	70.0	10.0	10	10.5	47.4	42.1	19
Time Devoted to Exer- cises	54.5	27.3	18.2	11	22.2	55.6	22.2	18
Costs to Participants or Institutions	30.0	70.0	--	10	52.6	47.4	--	19

MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

TABLE IIC

RATING OF SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF WORKSHOP
PERSONS WITH LITTLE OR NO EXPERIENCE VS. PERSONS WITH SOME EXPERIENCE
IN INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Item	Little or No Experience				Some Experience			
	Per Cent			N	Per Cent			N
	Exces- sive	About Right	Insuf- ficient		Exces- sive	About Right	Insuf- ficient	
Length of Workshop (10 days)	40.0	53.3	6.7	15	57.1	42.9	--	14
No. of Topics Covered (7)	40.0	60.0	--	15	21.4	78.6	--	14
Length of Individual Ses- sions (1-1/2 hrs.)	--	100.0	--	16	--	100.0	--	15
Frequency of Coffee Breaks (2/day)	--	100.0	--	16	6.7	93.3	--	15
Frequency of Formal Din- ners and Luncheons (3)	13.3	86.7	--	15	28.6	71.4	--	14
No. of Assignments to Participants	20.0	66.7	13.3	15	20.0	73.3	6.7	15
Feedback from Partic- ipants to Staff	6.2	56.3	37.5	16	--	58.3	41.7	12
Feedback from Staff to Participants	--	62.5	37.5	16	--	64.3	35.7	14
Opportunity to Discuss Material With Staff	--	38.5	61.4	13	--	83.3	16.7	12
No. of Participants (30)	--	93.8	6.2	16	--	100.0	--	15
No. of Special Lectures (2)	--	93.3	6.7	15	8.3	66.7	25.0	12
Amount of Free Time	--	53.3	46.7	15	28.6	57.1	14.3	14
Time Devoted to Exer- cises	13.3	60.0	26.7	15	57.1	35.7	7.1	14
Costs to Participants or Institution	40.0	60.0	--	15	50.0	50.0	--	14

ANALYSIS OF QUESTION: "What is your general reaction to the 'Exercise' approach for a workshop as compared with the straight lecture or lecture-question and answer method?"

A. <u>General Reaction</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Much prefer exercises	6	19.4
Prefer exercises	14	45.1
Prefer better balance of exercises and lecture-question	7	2.6
Prefer lecture or lecture-question	3	9.7
Much prefer lecture or lecture-question	<u>1</u>	<u>3.2</u>
	31	100.0

B. Criticisms of Exercises (55 per cent had negative criticism of exercises)

1. Should be fewer exercises with more time allowed.
2. Too little explanation; sat around table sharing ignorance; should have had calculator.
3. Exercises should have been shortened.
4. Some exercises meaningless.
5. Should have been more balance of presentation with less exercises.
6. Needed better explanation before doing exercises.
7. Some required more time than experience was worth.
8. Some too elementary and many too long; need slide rule or calculator.
9. Should have been more meaningful and less "busy work."
10. Waste of time; apparently a "filler."
11. Most were poor complements to learning.
12. Should have been better facilities for exercises.
13. Some too long; none directly orientated to small colleges.
14. Pace prevented gaining full value.

15. Overlapping; too much "busy work"; not generally applicable to small colleges.
16. Too much time spent on exercises.
17. Should have more "case study" type; exercises too long.

ANALYSIS OF ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS OR COMMENTS ABOUT WORKSHOP

1. New ideas; workshop well planned and executed; learned many new techniques.
2. Excellent; cannot suggest any real improvements.
3. Staff discussions and coffee breaks valuable.
4. Would be willing to duplicate the experience as it was.
5. Enjoyable and gained considerably from it.
6. Generally very good as is; but some repetition in lectures.
7. Just about all presentations were helpful in achieving objectives.
8. Appreciated "no nonsense" attitude.
9. It was a good idea; some exercises, however, could have been more coordinated with each other.
10. Location away from central city has advantages.

Follow-up Evaluation of Southern Workshop - Although the amount of elapsed time was really inadequate (particularly with a 3-month vacation period intervening), an attempt was made to obtain evaluative comments from participants of the Southern Workshop about 7 months after their attendance at it. Thus, participants could provide a frank, considered appraisal of any benefits derived from the experience, and could identify specific instances in which knowledge gained had been put to use. Ideally, such a follow-up should be made a year or more after the workshop, but time limits of the contract precluded such a delayed appraisal.

Reactions of the participants were solicited by an open-end letter which asked them for their evaluative thoughts now that some time had elapsed, and asked them to indicate any specific instances in which they had found useful information, contacts, techniques, etc., which they may have obtained at the workshop. A copy of the letter is included in the exhibits. Responses were received, without any follow-up, from 12 of the 29 participants.

Although selection of participants (made by the Southern Regional Education Board) was supposed to be limited only to individuals who had been assigned, or were about to be assigned, major responsibility for institutional research activities in their institutions, it is apparent from some of the replies that such responsibilities had not actually been assigned in some instances. In such instances, the opportunity to apply skills and knowledge gained from the workshop was practically non-existent.

Excerpts from respondents' letters follow, including favorable, non-committal, and unfavorable reactions.

"The greatest benefit which the workshop was to me was the opportunity to meet others in the Institutional Research field and to become acquainted with the literature. Perhaps the best single aspect of the workshop was the literature table."

Following the workshop, "... I requested materials on the faculty information system at the University of Minnesota... which I have used to develop a system of information for our college... Beyond this, I have used the information provided in the Workshop on Data Processing... Beyond this, I have begun developing a program of research on the student body..." including use of a variety of test instruments, such as the American College Testing Program, the Omnibus Personality Inventory, and the College and University Environment Scales.

"The point of the entire program, which is based on these and other data, is to have a greater and more sophisticated amount of information about students with a goal of curricular planning and collegiate planning in general. ... These are some

of the things that I have been up to since our Workshop...
... A good many of them stem from the materials covered in my work at Baton Rouge."

"... I can assure you that my participation in the January workshop at L.S.U. has been useful... The most significant single application of my experience was in assisting the West Virginia Commission on Higher Education in conducting a similar workshop for directors of institutional research in West Virginia. This workshop, held for one week during August, was fashioned very much after your January workshop and was considered very successful."

"Since I attended the AIR-SREB Southern Workshop on Institutional Research in Baton Rouge last January I have had no opportunity to get directly involved in institutional research... I have been doing all that I can to promote an institutional research office here... I have used some of the material supplied to us to support my recommendations, but as you may already know, the establishment of a new office within a University is a difficult thing."

"... I am not directly responsible for research of this nature, but do attempt to coordinate the various units in deriving material for the Vice President... In this regard, I suppose the major benefit to me of the Workshop was to acquaint me with the range and nature of institutional research and to enable me to communicate with the researchers. It is rather difficult for me to name specific items of activities in which the Workshop helped me."

"Ways workshop has been helpful: (1) awareness of common problems with other universities; and (2) contacts with resource personnel."

"My experiences at the Workshop contributed to my acceptance of the responsibilities associated with institutional research, with greater enthusiasm than would have existed if I had not attended the Workshop. ... the primary value of the experience was that I was provided an operational definition of institutional research. The exercises contributed to the operational definition, for in addition to defining the area, one was enabled to learn by doing."

"I attended in order to learn what Institutional Research was all about. ... At the moment we do not have any formalized department here for Institutional Research... Recently I finished a short study on our School of Education. The report covered... institutional and departmental objectives, organization of the school, faculty committee assignments, enrollments, comparison of enrollments for academic years with summer sessions,

comparison of graduate and undergraduate enrollments, student credit hour calculations, course curricula comparison with four other institutions, student evaluation by GPA and national accreditation tests, faculty loads, class sizes, credit hour production per instructor, cost factors, ... and ... building and floor space utilization comparison with other schools ... I feel that the conference helped me with every single one of the above topics..."

"Because of a pressing problem at the time, the information gained related to projections was most remembered and used."

"My participation in the workshop greatly expanded my concept of what institutional research includes. ... as a result of my participation in the workshop: (1) all institutional research to date has been coordinated by my office ...; (2) my proposal to establish an Office of Institutional Research was funded by the USOE ...; (3) about three months ago, we completed our ten-year projection -- a program which I coordinated; (4) the College has completed its profiles on last year's freshman and senior classes... This will be an on-going project at the college; (5) we are nearing the completion of our space-utilization study -- the first we have ever made; (6) a faculty analysis project ... is in the early stage with all raw data having been collected; and (7) we are likely to do a cost analysis for two of our academic programs this year."

"As I look back to the Workshop and attempt to recall specifics, it appears that the primary value of the experience was that I was provided an operational definition of institutional research. The exercises contributed to the operational definition, for in addition to defining the area, one was enabled to learn by doing."

"However, the workshop was very profitable to me in that it helped to (1) clarify for me some objectives and purposes of our newly formed and struggling office, (2) place, with greater confidence, priority on certain developments for the long-range benefit to the university and the research office, and (3) develop a clearer perspective of myself in the role of institutional researcher."

"The Workshop on Institutional Research sponsored by AIR & SREB held last year at Louisiana State University was a profitable experience. It provided me with a sense of direction, and made me aware of the many resources available in the field.....

In the next few months I should like to focus on financial studies, an area thus far neglected, yet one which demands investigation here. I plan to design the study after models and

use forms which were given on this topic at the Workshop. Without this experience I would not venture into this area.

In general, then, I feel that the Workshop has given me more confidence, a greater appreciation of the function of Institutional Research, more focus in my work, and a desire to devote more time to it than my present responsibilities allow."

In summary, respondents were able to point to a number of specific instances in which their experiences at the workshop proved to be useful. In addition, several reported that the broadened understanding they gained had been useful in planning for, assuming responsibility for, or directing institutional research activities.

Director's Evaluation -- In general, the workshops served their purpose well. Participants received a good general exposure to a set of basic problems with which they will sooner or later have to contend. They were exposed to different points of view concerning the scope and purposes of institutional research, and they received first-hand experience in designing studies, and in carrying out the several steps of a research project. If one thing was neglected, it was the complete experience of having to translate the results of a study into a document to report such results to administrators or others responsible for making decisions based on the study.

Although some complaints were received about the length of the workshops, others indicated that more time would have been useful. In general, it seems that about 10 days makes a good length for a workshop of this type. Similarly, experience suggests that about a day and a half on each topic is enough to cover the subject well and avoid boredom. On the other hand, in my opinion, not enough staff members made overnight assignments, for use in general discussion the next day. Modifications made by the staff in the second workshop, as a result of experience in the first workshop, indicated that the problem approach works best when the staff member provides an adequate framework or background about a topic before involving the participants in the exercises and problems. People react differently to sustained work-sessions, and some did not like the Sunday day of rest. Others found such a respite to be quite necessary. The Director's reaction is that the day off is necessary, even though the momentum is a bit hard to build up again the second week.

It is clear that participants gained a good deal from their interactions with each other, both formally and informally. The opportunity to discuss and argue alternative approaches, definitions, research attitudes, etc., when working on the prepared exercises, time and again proved to be most valuable and educative. Just sharing institutional problems with one another also proved informative. Some participants were more knowledgeable than others, and a lack of homogeneity of this kind produced some problems. However, such situations provided natural opportunities for leadership, and often proved more effective than those in which everyone was equally ill-informed. The trick is to provide some variation in experience in each sub-group, but not so much as to provide boredom on one end and embarrassment on the other end of the spectrum.

The effectiveness of the staff members as they worked individually with the sub-groups of participants varied, as did the type of exercises prepared. This type of instruction requires staff members who are at ease in unstructured situations, who can skillfully steer a group back on course, and who can

improvise to overcome defects in the exercises that are defeating the intent of the exercises. Obviously, it takes a great deal of skill to improvise exercises that have the feel of being actual problem situations and yet are not so complicated that they require much too much time or far too much routine computation to achieve results. More work is required in the development and use of such materials, but my general impression is that the potential in such an approach is well worth continued refinement of such materials.

Limiting the selection to newly-appointed institutional research supervisors was wise, although the number of inquiries from experienced people indicates a strong need for similar workshops devoted to study of research methodology at a more sophisticated level. Perhaps a series of advanced workshops could be a logical addition to sponsorship of training programs by the AIR.

Despite the marked difference in housing arrangements (and costs--much higher in the motel environment), neither group achieved the degree of out-of-class rapport and sustained discussion of workshop matters that I had hoped for. This may be accounted for by the heavy schedule, of course, with several evenings devoted to guest lecturers. If cost is not excessive, the motel environment (with a pool to relax by) seems to be preferable to the dormitory style housing available on most campuses.


No difficulty was apparent in freeing participants to attend the mid-winter workshop. It would seem that January and February might be used more for such workshops, instead of cramming them all into the summer months, where they frequently interfere or conflict with family vacation plans.

The summary of reactions from the participants speak for themselves, but I believe that the workshops were successful, provocative, and broadening for the participants who came with a sincere interest in learning more about institutional research. They were also very useful in trying out a somewhat new instructional approach for such sessions, and in providing contrasting information about scheduling such workshops, in terms of time and place. It is clear, too, that they could be improved upon, especially in the development and use of the special exercises.

Workshop Materials

Copies of the various announcement, forms, and some of the instructional materials associated with the two workshops will be found in the following pages. Because of the diverse nature and quantity of the total packet of instructional materials distributed to the participants, it is impossible to include everything with this bound copy of the final report.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FORMS



THE ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

AIR REGIONAL WORKSHOPS ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

A grant has been received from the Division of Research Training and Dissemination, United States Office of Education, for two eleven-day Regional Workshops on Institutional Research. Dr. John E. Stecklein, Director of the Bureau of Institutional Research at the University of Minnesota, will plan and direct the two Workshops - one in the South and one in the Midwest - on behalf of the Association for Institutional Research. The Southern and Midwest Workshops were originally conceived as part of a network of four workshops, with the other two to be located in the northeastern and western parts of the United States. Efforts are underway to obtain support for these latter workshops.

The network proposal evolved from concern expressed by members of the Association about the short supply of experienced people available to fill the many job openings in institutional research at the present time. The fastest form of feedback seemed to be a series of workshops to provide in-service training that would be helpful to the institutions in their efforts toward self-improvement.

The Workshops will be somewhat different from the usual workshops in that the number of formal presentations will be short, and the participants will work in pairs or small groups on special problems, exercises, case studies, or limited projects designed especially for the Workshops. In this way they will obtain from actual experience knowledge of major tasks and techniques involved in institutional research and a first-hand acquaintance with the problems of developing, conducting, and interpreting institutional studies. Each of the Workshops will have a regular staff of five specialists dealing with topics such as Student Studies, Fiscal Analysis, Curriculum Analysis, Faculty Studies, and Basic Data Collection and Utilization in intensive two-day sessions. Several invited lecturers will deal with other topics.

The Workshops will be designed for individuals who have recently assumed or have recently been assigned responsibility for institutional research in their colleges or universities. Priority will be given to individuals who are newest to the field. Enrollments will be limited to thirty (30) individuals in each Workshop, in order to maximize the amount of person-to-person contact between participants and staff members.

The Southern Workshop, to be co-sponsored by the Southern Regional Education Board in cooperation with the Louisiana State University, will be held January 28-February 8, 1968, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana on the campus of the Louisiana State University. Participation in a workshop will be limited to staff members of institutions or agencies located in the states served by the Southern Regional Education Board.

AIR REGIONAL WORKSHOPS ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

(continued)

The Midwest Workshop will be co-sponsored by the Institutional Research Council of Eleven in cooperation with the University of Minnesota, and will be held June 23 - July 4, 1968, at the Ambassador Motor Hotel in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Individuals eligible to participate in the Midwest Workshop must be staff members of colleges or universities or co-ordinating boards in the twelve north central states ranging from Ohio on the east to Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota on the west, and from Missouri on the south to Minnesota and Michigan on the north.

Announcements and application forms will be sent to the presidents of institutions in the respective regions who will be asked to nominate staff members for the workshops. The thirty (30) participants will be selected by a special workshop committee and notified of their acceptance about two months prior to the workshop dates.

No tuition charge will be made, but participants will pay their own travel and living costs, plus a small registration fee.

Inquiries about eligibility for the Southern Workshop should be addressed to:

Mr. E. F. Schietinger, Research Associate
Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street Northwest
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

Inquiries about eligibility for the Midwest Workshop should be addressed to:

Dr. John E. Stecklein
Bureau of Institutional Research
3338 University Avenue Southeast
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

11-14-67

NEWS RELEASE

(FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE)

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA PROFESSOR RECEIVES
GRANT FOR WORKSHOPS ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Word has been received from the Division of Research Training and Dissemination, United States Office of Education, that Dr. John E. Stecklein, Professor and Director of the Bureau of Institutional Research at the University of Minnesota has received a grant of \$15,993.00 for two eleven-day Regional Workshops on Institutional Research. Dr. Stecklein will plan and direct the two Workshops - one in the South and one in the Midwest - on behalf of the Association for Institutional Research, the national professional organization for people in that field. The Southern and Midwest Workshops were originally conceived as part of a network of four workshops, with the other two to be located in the northeastern and western parts of the United States. Efforts are underway to obtain support for these workshops.

The grant was made as part of the continuing concern of the United States Office of Education for the development and training of competent and qualified persons for educational research. Institutional research represents a special phase of educational research, one that is focused almost entirely on the operations, programs and personnel of institutions of higher education, or groups of such institutions.

The network proposal evolved from concern expressed by members of the Association about the short supply of experienced people available to fill the many job openings in institutional research at the present time. The fastest form of feedback seemed to be a series of workshops to provide in-service training that would be helpful to the institutions in their efforts toward self improvement.

The Workshops will be somewhat different from the usual workshops in that the number of formal presentations will be short, and the participants will work in pairs on special problems, exercises, case studies, or limited projects designed especially for the Workshops. In this way they will obtain from actual experience knowledge of major tasks and techniques involved in institutional research and a first-hand acquaintance with the problems of developing, conducting, and interpreting institutional studies. Each of the Workshops will have a regular staff of five specialists dealing with topics such as Student Studies, Fiscal Analysis, Curriculum Analysis, Faculty Studies, and Basic Data Collection and Utilization in

intensive two day sessions. Several invited lecturers will deal with other topics.

The Workshops will be designed for individuals who have recently assumed or have been assigned responsibility for institutional research in their colleges or universities. Priority will be given to individuals who are newest to the field. Enrollments will be limited to thirty (30) individuals in each Workshop, in order to maximize the amount of person-to-person contact between participants and staff members.

The Southern Workshop, to be co-sponsored by the Southern Regional Education Board in cooperation with the Louisiana State University, will be held January 28 - February 8, 1968, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana on the campus of the Louisiana State University. Participation in the workshop will be limited to staff members of institutions or agencies located in the states served by the Southern Regional Education Board.

The Midwest Workshop will be co-sponsored by the Institutional Research Council of Eleven in cooperation with the University of Minnesota, and will be held June 23 - July 4, 1968, at the Ambassador Motor Hotel in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Individuals eligible to participate in the Midwest Workshop must be staff members in colleges or universities or co-ordinating boards in the twelve north central states ranging from Ohio on the east to Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota on the west, and from Missouri on the south to Minnesota and Michigan on the north.

Dr. Stecklein, who was president of the Association for Institutional Research in 1965-66, has worked with the Executive Committee in planning the workshops as a public service project of the Association. Dr. Stecklein was also the recipient of a United States Office of Education training grant last year, in which he directed an inter-institutional post-doctoral internship program in Institutional Research involving five of the Big Ten Institutions. He has been at the University of Minnesota for fifteen years, is currently a Professor in Educational Psychology and has served as Director of the Bureau of Institutional Research since 1955. He received his PhD at the University of Wisconsin in statistics and measurement and has a Master's Degree in Physics from the Pennsylvania State University and a Bachelor's Degree in Mathematics and Physics from Whittier College.



SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD

130 SIXTH STREET, N. W. • ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30313 • 875-9211

October 17, 1967

Dear President:

During the period January 28 - February 8, 1968, the Southern Regional Education Board and the Association for Institutional Research, in cooperation with The Louisiana State University, will conduct a workshop for a limited number of persons recently assigned to institutional research responsibilities. There will be no tuition but participants will be responsible for their own transportation and living expenses and a nominal registration fee will be charged. Housing and instructional facilities for 30 participants have been reserved at Pleasant Hall on the Baton Rouge campus of Louisiana State University.

An intensive introductory program is being planned by Dr. John E. Stecklein of the University of Minnesota, workshop director, and a staff of nationally recognized specialists. Subjects covered by a case study approach will include student, faculty, curriculum and budget analyses, with special presentations on topics such as data processing, enrollment projections and admissions.

The Baton Rouge workshop is one of two regional workshops being funded next year by a grant from the United States Office of Education. Program details and application forms for the Southern workshop will be circulated by SREB within several weeks.

Sincerely yours,

Winfred L. Godwin
Director

WLG:wp



SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD

130 SIXTH STREET, N. W. • ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30313 • 875-9211

November 20, 1967

Dear President:

Enclosed are the final announcement and an application form for the Southern Workshop on Institutional Research, about which preliminary notification was sent on October 17, 1967, by Dr. Winfred L. Godwin. The Southern Regional Education Board invites you to nominate a representative from your institution.

Since enrollment will be limited to 30 participants, applications should be submitted as early as possible.


Yours sincerely,

E. F. Schietinger
Associate Director
for Research

EFS:vs
Enclosures



SOUTHERN WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH



Description of Program:

A two-week introductory workshop for persons recently appointed to positions involving major institutional research responsibilities. Study of students, faculty, curriculum, finance, and data collection and analyses will be covered by a work project approach. Participants will be assigned tasks and problems to complete as part of a deliberate involvement in the design, conduct, analyses, and interpretation stages of institutional research. Aspects of related institutional research topics will be handled in special lectures. Additional opportunity for contact with staff and for informal exchange concerning relevant research problems will be afforded.

Sponsorship, Place and Time:

Association for Institutional Research and Southern Regional Education Board, in cooperation with The Louisiana State University, with partial funding from the United States Office of Education. Pleasant Hall, Main Campus of L.S.U., Baton Rouge, Louisiana, January 28 (registration only) through February 8, 1968.

Selection of Participants:

In order to facilitate small group problem solving exercises and maximize contact with staff, enrollment will be limited to 30 participants, to be selected from colleges and universities in the 15 SREB states. A criterion for acceptance will be recency of appointment to institutional research assignments. All persons interested in attending should apply immediately, since the roster of participants will need to be completed within a two week period.

Cost:

No tuition will be charged. A registration fee of \$10 will be payable to the Southern Regional Education Board upon notification of acceptance. Participants will be responsible for their own travel and living expenses. Meals at Pleasant Hall will average approximately \$4 daily. Double-occupancy space with private bath will be available at \$4 daily per person.

Workshop Staff:

Dr. John W. Hamblen.....	Use of Computers
Project Director, Computer Sciences	
Southern Regional Education Board	
Dr. Paul Jedamus.....	Budget Analysis
Director, Institutional Research	
University of Colorado	
Dr. James Montgomery.....	Student Studies
Director, Institutional Research	
University of Tennessee	
Dr. Joseph L. Saupe.....	Curriculum Studies
Associate Director, Institutional Research	
Michigan State University	
Dr. E. F. Schietinger (Regional Agency Representative).....	Analysis of Data
Associate Director for Research	
Southern Regional Education Board	
Dr. John E. Stecklein (Workshop Director).....	Faculty Studies
Director, Bureau of Institutional Research	
University of Minnesota	
Dr. Kenneth M. Wilson.....	Interinstitutional Research
Director, College Research Center	
Vassar College	



SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD

130 SIXTH STREET, N. W. • ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30313 • 875-8211


TO: Participants in Southern Workshop on Institutional Research
FROM: E. F. Schietinger
DATE: January 9, 1968
SUBJECT: Final Program

Enclosed is the final Workshop program schedule; only minor revisions have been made. I should point out that the organized "plantation tour," originally scheduled for February 4, has been cancelled in view of the substantial number of the participants indicating a preference not to attend this function. There will, however, be opportunity for small groups to arrange for this trip by automobile.

Please be sure to bring with you the items of information about your institution which were requested in my letter of December 22. I look forward to seeing you in Baton Rouge.

E. F. Schietinger
E. F. Schietinger

EFS:vs
Enclosure



Midwest Workshop on Institutional Research

I
R
C
E

Description of Program:

A two-week introductory workshop for persons recently appointed to positions involving major institutional research responsibilities. Study of students, faculty, curriculum, finance, and data collection and analyses will be covered by a work project approach. Participants will be assigned tasks and problems to complete as part of a deliberate involvement in the design, conduct, analysis, and interpretation stages of institutional research. Aspects of related institutional research topics will be handled in special lectures. Additional opportunity for contact with staff and for informal exchange concerning relevant research problems will be afforded.

Sponsorship, Place and Time:

Association for Institutional Research and Institutional Research Council of Eleven, in cooperation with the University of Minnesota, with partial funding from the United States Office of Education. Ambassador Motor Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 23 (Registration, Dinner and Key-note speaker) through July 4, 1968.

Selection of Participants:

In order to facilitate small group problem-solving exercises and maximize contact with staff, enrollment will be limited to 30 participants, to be selected from colleges and universities in 12 Midwest states. A criterion for acceptance will be recency of appointment to institutional research assignments. All persons interested in attending should apply before Feb. 1, 1968; those accepted will be notified about Feb. 15, 1968.

Cost:

No tuition will be charged. A registration fee of \$15 will be payable to the University of Minnesota upon notification of acceptance. Participants will be responsible for their own travel and living expenses. Except for an opening dinner with a key-note speaker and two planned luncheons, meal arrangements will be left to the individual. Paid reservations for the dinner and luncheons will also be requested in advance, at the time of notification of acceptance. Double-occupancy space with private bath will be available at \$11 per person per day.

Workshop Staff:

Dr. Paul Jedamus Budget Analysis
Director, Institutional Research
University of Colorado

Dr. James Montgomery Student Studies
Director, Institutional Research
University of Tennessee

Dr. Joseph L. Saupe Curriculum Studies
Associate Director, Institutional Research
Michigan State University

Dr. L. J. Lins Data Collection and Utilization
Director of Research
Coordinating Committee for Higher Education, The State of Wisconsin

Dr. John E. Stecklein (Workshop Director) Faculty Studies
Director, Bureau of Institutional Research
University of Minnesota

Additional guest lecturers.

APPLICATION FOR SOUTHERN WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Date _____

Dr. E. F. Schietinger
Associate Director for Research
Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street, N. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

This is my application for enrollment in the Southern Workshop on Institutional Research at The Louisiana State University, January 28 - February 8, 1968. It is my understanding that suitability of the Workshop program to the needs of the respective applicants will guide selection of participants. To assist in this selection, the following information is supplied:

- (1) The nature of my institutional research assignment is as follows: _____

- (2) Responsibility for this assignment dates from: _____
- (3) The most advanced computer facility available on this campus to offices performing institutional research is: _____

If selected for attendance at the Southern Workshop, my housing requirements will be as follows:

- (1) Double occupancy at Pleasant Hall (\$4.00 daily per person) ☐
- (2) Other ☐ (explain) _____

I understand that there is no charge for tuition, that participants will be responsible for their own transportation and expenses, and that a registration fee of \$10 will be payable to SREB by each participant upon acceptance.

Name: _____ Title: (Mr., Dr., Mrs., etc.) _____

Position: _____

Institution: _____

Street Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____

APPLICATION FOR MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Date _____

Dr. John E. Stecklein
Director, Bureau of Institutional Research
University of Minnesota
3338 University Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

This is my application for enrollment in the Midwest Workshop on Institutional Research, to be held at the Ambassador Motor Hotel in Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 23 - July 4, 1968. It is my understanding that suitability of the Workshop program to the backgrounds and experience of the respective applicants will guide selection of participants. To assist in this selection, the following information is supplied:

(1) The nature of my institutional research assignment is as follows: _____

(2) Responsibility for this assignment dates from: _____

(3) Previous experience in institutional research consists of: _____

If selected for attendance at the Midwest Workshop, my housing requirements will be as follows:

- (1) Double occupancy (2 double beds) (\$11.00 daily per person for 2) ☐
(2) Single (one double bed) (\$13.00 per day for 1, \$17.00 per day for 2) ☐
(3) Other ☒ (explain) _____

I understand that there will be no charge for tuition, but participants will be responsible for their own transportation and expenses, and that a registration fee of \$15 will be payable to Midwest Workshop by each participant upon notification of acceptance to the Workshop.

Name: _____ Title: (Mr., Dr., Mrs., etc.) _____

Position: _____

Institution: _____

Street Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____

SOUTHERN/ALSO MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
January 28-February 8, 1968

Institutional Data to be Provided by Participants
for Use in Workshop Exercise

Participant _____

Institution _____

By using appropriate institutional sources, provide each of the following items of information. Use estimates where necessary. Include summer. The data is for workshop use, only. It will not be published. Institutional anonymity will be maintained.

1. Head count enrollment, Summer 1965 _____
Fall 1966 _____
Winter 1966 (If applicable) _____
Spring 1966 _____ (S)
2. Full time equivalent count of teaching faculty (number of full time plus appropriate fraction of part-time, including chairman), 1966-67: _____ (F)
3. Total operating expenditures for educational and general purposes (exclude auxiliary enterprises) 1966-67: \$ _____ (E)
4. Total salaries of teaching faculty, 1966-67:¹ \$ _____ (W)
5. Total income from tuition and fees, 1966-67: \$ _____ (T)
6. Other income for educational and general purposes, 1966-67:² \$ _____ (I)
7. Total student credit hours taught, 1966-67:³
quarter system _____ or semester system _____ (check one) _____ (H)
8. Total credits of classes taught, 1966-67:⁴ _____ (R)
9. Average annual faculty teaching load in credit of classes, 1966-67:⁴ _____ (L)
10. Average class size, 1966-67:⁴ _____ (C)

- Notes:
- 1 This figure should be total salaries paid to the individuals counted in item #2, Average salary = $\frac{\#4}{\#2}$
 - 2 Assuming income = expenditures, $\#6 = \#3 - \#5$
 - 3 This figure may be estimated by multiplying the average student course load in credit hours (e.g., 12 or 15 credits) for each quarter or semester by the enrollment counts in item #1.
 - 4 Only one of items #8, #9, and #10, is required. Enter the one which is most readily available and accurate. Enter more than one if possible. "Credits of classes" is the sum of the credit values of all sections taught.

UNIVERSITY OF *Minnesota*

BUREAU OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

To: Participants
Midwest Workshop on Institutional Research

We now have final plans set for the Midwest Workshop on Institutional Research to be held at the Ambassador Motor Hotel here in Minneapolis, Minnesota. A copy of the "Program Schedule" is enclosed.

It will be helpful to us to know your approximate time of arrival at the Ambassador Motor Hotel. Therefore we are asking that you complete the brief questionnaire enclosed and return it within a few days. As indicated earlier, it is required that each participant be in attendance for the entire Workshop. Since we have not heard to the contrary, we expect that each of you will be in attendance. If you find that for good reason you cannot attend, please call Dorolese Wardwell of my office immediately (Area 612, phone 373-2263).

We have not scheduled meetings for Saturday afternoon, June 29, or Sunday, June 30. In past Workshops, we have found that there are definite advantages in leaving time for the participants to interact with each other. The motel has fine facilities for relaxation and group discussion. Some of you as a group may want to attend activities in the greater Minneapolis area over the weekend. We have put together a listing of some of the activities taking place. If we can help in making some arrangements for you, we will be glad to do so. We also will have a library of institutional research reports set up at the motel; each of you will want to make use of that library.

Also enclosed is an institutional data form, "Institutional Data to be Provided by Participants for Use in Workshop Exercises." The Workshop staff requests that you complete the form for your institution and bring it with you to Minneapolis. The data will be used in some of the exercises. In addition to the data form, you also are requested to bring along: (1) a copy of your institution's 1966-67 catalog, (2) a copy of your institution's fall 1966 schedule of course offerings, (3) a 1966-67 institutional financial report including "educational and general" categories, (4) a copy of the fall 1966 institutional enrollment report in as much detail as available, (5) six transcripts of June 1967 graduates who did all of their academic work at your institution; three should be for mathematics majors and three for history majors, and (6) a copy of the "Fact Book" for your institution if such has been set up for the institution.

We assume that you have made your motel reservations. If you have any questions relative to the Workshop, do not hesitate to contact us. We are looking forward to seeing you on June 23.

Sincerely yours,

John E. Stecklein
Director

Enc.

PUBLICATIONS ON DISPLAY

MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

AIR Publications

The Roll of Institutional Research in Planning - Third Annual National Institutional Research Forum

A Conceptual Framework For Institutional Research - Fourth Annual National Institutional Research Forum

Design and Methodology in Institutional Research - Fifth Annual National Institutional Research Forum

Research on Academic Input - Sixth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research

The Instructional Process and Institutional Research - Seventh Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research

A Look At the Charter Member of AIR

Proceedings of the Research Conference on College Dropouts - University of Tennessee

Academic Crossover Study Distribution of Fall 1964 Under-graduate Enrollments

Analysis of Applications to the University of Minnesota Graduate School

Bureau of Institutional Research-Publications Bibliography Since Approximately 1947-University of Minnesota

Capital Improvements Program-The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education-A Progress Report

Changing Patterns of College Attendance - SREB-Financing Higher Education

Characteristics & Activities of the 1962-63 Full-Time Academic Staff of the University of Minnesota

The College Curriculum - An Approach to Analysis - SREB

College Teachers and College Teaching (A Third Supplement)

A Comparison of Publication Forms Used By the Faculty, 1935-36 & 1955-56 - Bureau of Institutional Research - University of Minnesota

Cooperative Planning For Computers and Computer Science Programs in Higher Education

Current Operating Income and Expenditures, Oklahoma State Colleges and Universities Fiscal Year 1965-66

Establishing New Senior Colleges - SREB

Exam Practices Study - A Survey of Classroom Testing in Undergraduate Courses at the University of Minnesota - 1968

Fact Book on Higher Education in the South

Financing Higher Education - Southern Regional Education Board

A Follow-Up Study of Students Enrolled At the University of Minnesota Spring Quarter 1959 Who Did Not Return Fall Quarter 1959

A Four Decade Look At the Academic Staff of the University of Minnesota

BIR - General Education Committee Preliminary Report on General Studies - University of Minnesota

Guide to Academic Planning - University of Colorado - 1967-68

Guidelines For Planning Computer Centers in Universities and Colleges - SREB

Intercollegiate Athletics and Academic Progress - BIR - University of Minnesota

Measures of Academic Aptitude on First-Year Post-High School Students In the Area-Vocational - Technical Schools of Minnesota

Minnesota Architects Look at Architectural Education - BIR - University of Minn.

Miscellaneous Reports - Office of Institutional Research Michigan State University - Volume I - Curriculum

Miscellaneous Reports - Office of Institutional Research Michigan State University - Volume II - Students

Miscellaneous Reports - Office of Institutional Research Michigan State University - Volume III

Some Environmental Influences & Student Attitudes in the University of Tennessee

Reference Handbook of Information on Students - University of Tennessee

The Negro and Higher Education In the South

Of Time and the Doctorate - SREB

Preliminary Report on the Departmental Practices Study - University of Minnesota

Regional Action - Four SREB Conferences Focus on Negro Colleges and Action Programs

Report of A Survey to Determine the Need for and Feasibility of The Establishment of a Community Junior College In Tulsa

Research Designed To Improve Institutions of Higher Learning

A Review of the Literature Concerning Studies of College Teaching Methods and Class Size

SREB - The Year-Round Calendar in Operation

Statistics for the Sixties - Higher Education in the South - SREB

Student Attitudes Toward Reserve Officer Training Corps Programs - University of Minnesota

Student Finances Study - University of Minnesota

Summary of State Legislation Affecting Higher Education in the South - SREB

The Summer Session - Its Role in the University of Minnesota Program

Survey of Sources of Support For Football Marching Bands in Western Conference Universities

University of Minnesota - TV College Research Report #1 - Students Enrolled in the TV College, Fall '64

TV College Report #2 - The TV College Non-credit Audience, Winter, 1965 (December)

Thirteenth Annual Survey of Minnesota College and University Enrollments

Upper Division Programs of University of Minnesota Arts College Graduates

Volume of Instruction Analysis Fall Term 1966 - Michigan State University

Where Midwestern Students Are Educated In Medicine, Dentistry, Vet. Medicine, Pharmacy and Forestry - University of Minnesota

MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

Under the following headings please put down questions which you wish discussed by staff and participants during one of the Workshop sessions:

1. The place of Institutional Research in the institutional structure
2. The role of the Institutional Research office in determination of institutional policy
3. Coordination of Institutional Research projects with faculty
4. Communication of Institutional Research findings
5. Financing of Institutional Research
6. Staffing of the Institutional Research office
7. Institutional Research in the small institutions
8. The nature of Institutional Research
9. The collection of institutional data
10. Other

BUREAU OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
3338 UNIVERSITY AVENUE S.E. • MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55414

October 15, 1968

Dear Colleague:

You will recall that during the AIR-SREB Southern Workshop on Institutional Research, held at the Louisiana State University the end of January, I told you that we might be following up the Workshop with a request for evaluation at the end of the Workshop, but the real test of value of an experience of that type is the extent to which a person can actually put to use ideas or techniques that he has learned there.

The purpose of this letter, therefore, is to ask you to send me a short letter in which you list ways in which your experience in the Workshop has been helpful to you in your activities since the Workshop. I realize that eight months is not a long time in which to develop activities that may lend themselves to some of the things you were exposed to in the Workshop, but I hope it is long enough for you to identify a few tangible incidents of application. If you cannot identify such incidents, or if such application proved to be unsatisfactory, I would like to know that, too of course.

If you wish to add any other comments, or revisions of your earlier evaluative responses, we will be glad to receive those, too. I would appreciate a reply within two weeks if possible.

Forgive me for bothering you at this time, but your after-the-fact report of utility will be very useful to me as I prepare an evaluation for the workshop idea for the USOE. Thanks very much for your help.

Although I am currently in Concepcion, Chili, it will be best if your reply is sent to me at my University of Minnesota address (shown above), where all replies will be collected and forwarded to me. My job here at the University of Concepcion is very interesting, but rather frustrating at times. Right now the students and teaching faculty are just completing ratification of an administrative reform that was brought about by a series of major student strikes since last September. The new reform does away with the lay board of directors and replaces it with a board composed wholly of faculty, students (25%), administrators, and civil service personnel (3%). The new Rector who was elected in May has offered to resign so the new broader constituency can elect its own Rector and Vice-Rector. For that election, all students and all teaching faculty will have a vote. It will be most interesting to see how the new system will work, but in the meantime progress on our project is extremely slow.

Sincerely,

John E. Stecklein
John E. Stecklein
Workshop Director

JES:eb

MIDWEST WORKSHOP ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Survey of Participants

Institutional Information:

Name: _____
 1967 Fall Enrollment: _____ Control: Public _____ Private _____

Highest Level of Degree: Two-year _____ Bachelor's _____ Master's _____

Doctor's _____
 Organization for Institutional Research:

"Centralized" _____ "Decentralized" _____

If Centralized:
 Title of Office _____

Number of Staff: _____

Professional _____ Graduate Assistants _____

Clerical _____ Other (explain) _____

Head of Office Reports to: _____

Distribution of Responsibilities:

Percent Time Spent on Recurring Studies _____

Percent Time on One-time Studies _____

Percent Time on Other Functions, if any (explain) _____

Distribution of Institutional Research Functions:

	Performed by Your Office	Other Office Performing Function (Specify)	Not Performed
Space Studies			
Faculty Studies			
Student Studies			
Fiscal Analysis			
Curriculum Analysis			
Projections			
Answering Questionnaires			
Other (explain)			

Is there an Advisory Committee? Yes _____ No _____
 (Please add amplifications on reverse of schedule).

STUDENT STUDIES

Student Studies - Introduction (1 Page)

- Enrollment Units (1 page)
- Campus Climate Unit, Part I (1 page)
- * Campus Climate Unit, Part II (9 pages)
- Campus Climate Unit, Part III (3 pages)
- * Admissions Unit (9 pages)

**Tape - An Instrument for the Measurement of Student Perceptions of College (4 pages)

*Pre-Admissions Evaluation and College Scholastic Progress Patterns (10 pages)

*Free Choice Vs. Planned Accommodation: Contrasting State Approaches to Student Input (Dorothy Knoell) (6 pages)

*Some Practical Applications of Research Studies (O.W. Hascall) (8 pages)

*Student choice as an Instrument of Higher Education Policy (Dan S. Hobbs) (6 pages)

*Trends in the Characteristics of Entering College Students, 1961-1965 (Alexander W. Astin) (6 pages)

*Problems of Selection at a Small, Selective College (Ruth Churchill) (6 pages)

*Selection of Students by Colleges Within a State System (John R. Hills) (5 pages)

*Teaching - Learning Issues (No. 6, Winter 1968, Prepared by the Learning Resources Center, University of Tennessee) (6 pages)

*A Research Orientation to Selection, Admission and Differential Education (20 pages)

*Multiple Regression Solution (5 pages)

*Feedback Supplement (1 page)

*Student Studies Bibliography (2 pages)

Student Studies - Evaluation Unit (2 pages)

STUDENT STUDIES (Continued)

Student Studies - Eric Unit (1 page)

I.	Questions based on Research in Education,	March 1967	(1 page)
II.	" " " "	" "	, May 1967 (1 page)
III.	" " " "	" "	, June, 1967 (1 page)
IV.	" " " "	" "	, July, 1967 (1 page)
V.	" " " "	" "	, August, 1967 (1 page)

****Answers to Questions from Research in Education (5 pages)**

****Items not included in bound report.**

STUDENT STUDIES

Introduction

Students, obviously, are important to a college. It almost naturally follows that these students will be the subject of evaluations, reviews, and studies. Institutional studies on students may be undertaken in a number of areas: characteristics of students, types of admission procedures used, graduation and attrition studies, grades and other measures of success in college, students' perceptions of self and college, personality measures, enrollment projections, and a host of others. The imagination of the researcher and the resources available to him are the major factors limiting the number, type, and intensity of such studies.

Since material on only a limited number of studies on students can be presented in this Workshop, the units are restricted in number and selected to give typical examples of problems of definition and methodology.

The Outline for the Student Studies section follows:

UNITS

Enrollment	Monday
Campus Climate	
Part I	Monday
Part II	Monday
Admissions	Monday
Evaluation	Tuesday
Eric	Tuesday

STUDENT STUDIES

Enrollments Unit

Perhaps the beginning point for institutional research studies on students is the development of reliable enrollment counts for each term and for each year. In this connection, please answer the following questions.

1. What type of enrollment categories might be maintained and which would be minimum essential categories for your institution?
2. What type of information does the U. S. Office of Education request?
3. Develop a table (or tables) which would be appropriate for keeping tract of enrollment at your institution. Following are a few ideas on what might be considered--other items might also be appropriate: full time, part time, first-time enrollments, transfers, full time equivalents, college class, academic college or program, sex, and marital status.

STUDENT STUDIES

Campus Climate Unit

Part I

Members of the faculty have recently expressed a real concern over the number of drop outs at your university or college. They have posed several questions in this regard to the Office of Institutional Research:

1. How many students from our institution drop out each year?
2. How many students who enter here will obtain a Bachelor's Degree?
3. What percent drop out for non-academic reasons and what are these reasons? What percent leave for academic reasons?

You have the following resources at your disposal:

Access to student records which would include ACT or SAT (or equivalent scores), HSGPA, GPA at your institution, the academic record each quarter for the students, and questionnaires compiled at exit interviews held by the Dean of Students. Home town information and place of residence while a student is available; the socio-economic standing of the student or his family is not contained in existing records.

A Faculty Committee on Attrition Rates has requested you to prepare an outline of how you would go about accomplishing a study of student attrition rates. The outline might take into consideration the following items:

1. The sampling procedure, if any, to be used.
2. What is the definition of a drop out? How does one clarify part-time students, transfers (both in and out), students who leave and return?
3. How long should the study take and what might be the cost?
4. What are ways in which attrition rates can be measured? In this connection, what are the primary differences, advantages, and disadvantages between a cross-sectional survey, a longitudinal survey, and an historical study?
5. In what form might the final results be expressed? Please give examples.

STUDENT STUDIES

Evaluation Unit

Your college or university has decided to conduct a tutoring program to help the freshmen who are having difficulty with the basic English course. Approximately 25 percent of the students fail this course each term. Based on entrance examinations and high school grade averages, the freshman class appears about average for this section of the U. S. A. The tutoring section (or sections) will meet once per week for two hours. It is almost certain that 50 students will make application to attend the tutoring sessions; however, the program will be voluntary and students will not have to attend. Those students who attend may withdraw at any time they choose to do so. There will be no charge to the students. An instructor (tutor) will be available for each 15 students who attend to provide guidance in writing and to critique papers submitted in class. The Dean (Vice-President) has asked you to evaluate the effectiveness of this tutoring program during the forthcoming year. You have been talking about this project for some time, and certain questions concerning the best approach to evaluate this program have arisen.

1. In order to determine if the tutoring program is having an effect on grades in the basic English course, with whom should the students who are tutored be compared, or what control group should be used? What is the definition of a tutored student (attended one session, two sessions, etc.)?
2. Since a part of the evaluation will consist of a questionnaire that will be given to tutored students in order to find their opinions or attitudes toward the program, what are examples of the type of items

that might be included in the questionnaire? (Try to develop four to six sample items for inclusion.)

3. What information concerning the students should be collected for this evaluation? How might this information (variables) be used in the evaluation?

4. What related studies in the literature might be of help?

It is suggested that each member of the group prepare four to six items for the questionnaire and think of appropriate ways to proceed with the overall evaluation. Please develop one group solution for the total problem, to which might be added each individual's items for the questionnaire. Each member might read the items prepared by the other members of his group and suggest corrections if any are needed. Then the group could present in their solution the 12-18 corrected and edited items.

STUDENT STUDIES

Eric Unit

In an effort to familiarize you with Research in Education, a publication of ERIC (Educational Research Information Center), the following questions on a single issue have been compiled.

Research in Education is a compilation of abstracts of recently published reports and project resumes of studies in progress in the field of educational research. Both the REPORT RESUMES and the PROJECT RESUMES sections are followed by an AUTHOR INDEX, an INSTITUTION INDEX, a SUBJECT INDEX, a PROGRAM INDEX, and a CONTRACT AND GRANT NUMBER INDEX. Most of the questions you will receive can be answered by locating apropos keywords in the SUBJECT INDEX, then reading the REPORT RESUMES which seem relevant to the question and choosing the most pertinent report(s). However, you will note that some questions are phrased so that you will want to use the AUTHOR INDEX or the INSTITUTION INDEX.

I. Questions based on

Research in Education

March, 1967

1. You would like your secretary to assign keywords to all the educational documents in your office for easy retrieval. What report might aid her in compiling a workable list of terms?
2. If you were conducting a dormitory cluster-class study (one in which students who live together in a dormitory are put into several classes together, to determine the effects of such clustering upon grade point average, self-concept, etc.) what report might you refer to in order to compare roommates' relative self concepts?
3. You are just organizing an educational research center at your school and would like to know about similar operations at other schools. What report would give you an over-all view of educational research in the United States?
4. You wish to conduct a study of college dropouts and have heard that a similar study is being conducted at Princeton University. Using the institution index and the report resumes, obtain the name of a man whom you might want to contact for suggestions.
5. Your English department would like to revise its undergraduate program. What report might you recommend to the head of the department?
6. You wish to predict the academic success of all the students in one dormitory. They have already been given personality tests which measured the variability of their behavior. What resume of a study currently in progress would suggest a means of using this information in predicting academic success?
7. Your political science department is progressive and always open to suggestions about teaching methods. What university might you suggest that the head of your department write for advice?

II. Questions Based on

Research in Education

May, 1967

1. Your psychology department plans to study the relation between the student's field of study and his problem of discovering his "identity." The individual who plans to conduct the study thinks that similar research has been carried out at the University of Chicago. Find the report dealing with the study he has in mind.
2. Your history department is considering televised instruction as a means of dealing with a rapidly increasing enrollment. What study might prove encouraging to the department?
3. The romance languages department at your school wants to revamp its entire program, including the teaching techniques presently being used. You have heard that William J. Smither of Tulane University has spent several years studying techniques for teaching foreign languages. What report by him do you find readily available?
4. You wish to test for creativity in your honors students. What report might suggest means of testing for this personality trait?
5. You would like to set up an easy-retrieval system for locating documents gathered by your office of institutional research. One means of accessioning documents for future retrieval is to assign descriptive keywords to each book or article. What report suggests a keyword system you might want to use?
6. The college of education at your university is considering adding an undergraduate program in educational research. You have heard that the University of Florida is considering the same addition to its curriculum. From what project currently in progress might you want to watch for a final report?
7. You are employed by a small college which is considering developing a group counseling program for freshmen. Whom might you want to write for an evaluation of such a program on a campus of that size?

III. Questions Based on

Research in Education

June, 1967

1. You wish to organize an Educational Resources Center at your school. You have heard that Wayne State University already has such a center and that it was carefully planned in advance. What is the ERIC accession number and title of the report dealing with this center?
2. The students at your college are predominantly Negro. You wish to predict their academic success in college from their SAT scores. What report might shed some light on the predictive problems you might encounter?
3. Your psychology department wishes to explore the possibility of applying programmed instruction techniques to its televised lecture course. What report might you recommend for suggestions and encouragement?
4. Your college is in the process of setting up a counseling center. What report might you recommend to the proposed director?
5. Your school is considering admitting some freshmen "on probation." What study currently in progress might help you determine which marginal applicants should be accepted on a probationary basis?

IV. Questions Based on

Research in Education

July, 1967

1. Robert J. Dowd's research suggests that one means of comparing creativity to academic performance is to administer two types of tests. What are these two types?
2. You have heard that a joint study of college drop-outs included Hanover College. What is the ERIC accession number and title of the report dealing with this work?
3. If you were going to analyze the academic and social expectations of incoming college freshmen, what report might you want to read?
4. Your college is re-evaluating its in loco parentis status; what report might you want to disseminate to interested faculty members and administrators?
5. Your school has recently instituted a graduate program in the arts and sciences and would like to evaluate it. What study might suggest methods of evaluation?
6. If you wanted to compile a list of characteristics of the students attending your school, what report might suggest the characteristics to be compiled?
7. If you wish to predict the academic success of transfer students at your school, what reports might you want to read?

V. Questions Based on

Research in Education

August, 1967

1. You are conducting a dormitory cluster-class study, in which the effects upon grade point average of students' living together and attending several classes together will be measured. You have given personality tests which measured each student's self-concept. What study might suggest how the information already obtained may be used to predict the students' level of achievement?
2. A faculty member has suggested that there are more students with leadership ability on campus than have been recognized. Your psychology department has offered to conduct campus-wide testing to determine whether this is true and whether leadership ability may be broken down into types. What individual at Indiana University might be able to advise your psychologists about methods to use?
3. It is rumored that many students at your university who cannot make passing grades in one college will switch to another, "easier" college within the university. What report deals with this same problem?
4. Assume that you have been contacted by individuals who are trying to determine the best location for a new junior college. What reports might you suggest they read?
5. If a department in your school were toying with the idea of a team-teaching, why might you suggest that they read report ED 011 012?
6. If your school were just introducing televised instruction, what report might you want to pass along to those persons planning the format?
7. What coming report will apparently deal with the type workshop you are presently attending?

CURRICULUM

****Introduction to Institutional Research on the Curriculum (1 page)**

Bibliography (1 page)

8 Exercises (13 pages)

1. Catalog Course Offerings
2. Major Programs
3. Transcript Analysis
4. Student Course Loads
5. Course Enrollment Cross-Overs
6. Courses Offered with Small Enrollments and Courses Not Taught
7. Relationships Between the Curriculum and the Budget
8. Course Models--Efficiency and Effectiveness

**An Analysis of the Transcripts of a Sample of June, 1967,
Graduates By Department (4 pages)**

***Curriculum - Appraisal of Research Activities (7 pages)**

***Items not included in bound report.**

****Items not included in bound report.**

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

AN ANALYSIS OF THE TRANSCRIPTS OF A SAMPLE OF JUNE, 1967, GRADUATES
BY DEPARTMENT

DEPARTMENT _____ COLLEGE _____

Number of June Graduates _____

The Sample: Natives _____, Transfers _____ Total _____

Honors College _____ Degrees: BA _____ BS _____

FULFILLMENT OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE REQUIREMENTS (Natives Only, N = _____)

	ATL	NS	SS	HUM
Number taking all required credits	_____	_____	_____	_____
Number waiving some/all required cr.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Numbers substituting other courses	_____	_____	_____	_____
Number neither waiving nor substituting	_____	_____	_____	_____
Total	_____	_____	_____	_____

FULFILLMENT OF COLLEGE/DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENTS (Total Sample, N = _____)

Requirement	Credits	Analysis
_____	_____	
_____	_____	
_____	_____	

MAJOR PREFERENCE: PATTERN OF CHANGE (Natives only, N = __)

Number
in
Sample Pattern

___ A:
___ B:
___ C:
___ D:
___ E:
___ F:
___ G:

Number
in
Sample Pattern

___ H:
___ I:
___ J:

ATTENDANCE PATTERNS (Total sample, N = __)

Number attending: fewer than 12 terms --accelerated ___
12 terms --normal ___
more than 12 terms (full time) --extended ___
more than 12 terms (part time) --extended ___

Number enrolled in MSU Fall Term, 1967, for graduate studies ___

HONORS (Honors College, N = __; Others N = __)

Honors College students enrolling in at least one honors section ___
Range in number of credits taken in honors sections ___

Others enrolling in at least one honors section ___
Range in number of credits taken in honors sections ___

ACADEMIC ACTIONS TAKEN (Total sample, N = __)

	<u>Lower Division</u>	<u>Upper Division</u>
<u>Repeats:</u> Repeats allowed in catalog regulations	<u>20</u> crs.	<u>12</u> crs.
Students repeating at least one course	___	___
Student exceeding repeats allowed	___	___
Highest number of credits repeated by a single student	___ crs.	___ crs.

Probation: Students on probation

one term	___	five terms	___
two terms	___	terms	___
three terms	___	terms	___
four terms	___	terms	___

DISTRIBUTION OF CREDITS (Total Sample N =)

Required Distribution (see Catalog)

	<u>Required</u>
Credits _____	_____
Credits _____	_____
Credits _____	_____
Credits _____	_____

Analysis

Liberal/Professional Distribution (with major shown separately)

	BA Degree			BS Degree		
	Range	Median	Average	Range	Median	Average
Humanities						
+Major						
Social Science						
+Economics						
+Major						
Natural Science						
+Major						
Professional						
+Major						

ELECTIVES CHOSEN (Natives only, N = __)

Liberal Arts Areas/Number Electing

Professional Areas/Number Electing

[illegible]

Withdrawals:

Deletions of Credits and Honor Points on Transcript

<u>Foreign Language:</u>	Number having one/two terms of beginning foreign language deleted because full year's work was <u>not</u> completed (as per catalog)	_____
	Number to whom above regulation was <u>not</u> applied	_____
	Number who graduated counting foreign language credits which should have been deleted	_____
<u>Other deletions:</u>	Number who deleted MSU D's and F's by repeating work at junior colleges	_____
	Number for whom deletions were made by MSU of credits/honor points to improve GPA and allow student to continue	_____
	Courses and credits deleted:	

IRREGULARITIES NOTED

FISCAL ANALYSES

****Problems and Questions for Fiscal Analysis Section of Midwest
Workshop on Institutional Research (16 pages)**

Problems and Questions for Fiscal Analysis (3 pages)

****Items not included in bound report.**

Problems and Questions for Fiscal Analysis Section of Southern Workshop on Institutional Research.

I. Monthly Updated Budget and Departmental Roster

Problem 1.

- A) Design a form for an up-dated monthly departmental budget and personnel roster that will maintain a record of changes throughout the fiscal year and also reflect proposed changes for the next fiscal year.
- B) Articulate a system for implementing this roster.

II. Functional Budget Analysis

Problem 2.

- A) Using the forms provided, make a functional budget analysis for your institution.
- B) Make a list of the problems of definition and classification that you had in accomplishing part A.
- C) How would you interpret these data to your administration?
- D) Assume that you have collected similar data from other institutions. What factors would you have to take into account in making inter-institutional comparisons?

III. Instructional Salary Cost Studies

Problem 3.

- A) Articulate a system for making a study of instructional salary costs by level of course. Pay particular attention to problems of definition.
- B) How might these data be used internally? Consider both the interpretation of differences among departments and changes within departments over time.

- C) How might these data be used in conjunction with similar data from comparable institutions? Make a list of problem areas.
- D) Identify, if you can, several major difficulties one might encounter in using these data for program budgeting.

IV. Head Count Enrollment Estimates

Problem 4.

- A) Build a model for estimating fall head count enrollment for the next ten years at your institution. Be sure to specify the categories of students that must be included and the method you will use to estimate each category.
- B) Make a list of the assumptions implicit in your model.
- C) Make a list of the major problems you would expect to encounter in making your estimates.

V. Costs per student by level of student

Problem 5.

Your governing board asks your president - and he asks you - how much it costs to produce a bachelor's degree in sociology. Develop a method that will provide him with a reasonable answer. Remember that sociology majors take courses over a broad range of subject areas outside of sociology.

VI. Faculty Salary Analysis

Problem 6.

- A) Develop a table or series of tables to present faculty salaries. Include only statistics and comparisons that are relevant to decision making. Do not include unnecessary detail.
- B) Make a list of areas where you think you might run into definitional or procedural problems and suggest solutions.

- C) You are assigned the task of making an inter-institutional salary comparison. Design a form for a questionnaire to obtain the data, including definition of terms.

VII. Coordination of Planning

Problem 7.

- A) Design a system that incorporates enrollment forecasts, cost data, space studies and academic planning into a comprehensive institutional plan.
- B) Articulate the role to be played by institutional research in this process.

ENROLLMENTS

*Enrollment Estimate and Projection Techniques

*Exercise I - Table I Weighted Births: Births Converted to
September 1 (4 pages)

*Exercise II - Relationship Between Number of High School
Graduates and Number of New Resident Freshman
(13 pages)

*Exercise III - Comparison of Change in Population and High
School Graduates (8 pages)

*Projection of Enrollment for Campus Planning, L. J. Lins and
Allan P. Abell (13 pages)

*Estimates and Projections of Enrollment for the University of
Wisconsin and Wisconsin State Universities, Wisconsin Coordina-
ting Council March, 1968 (36 pages)

*Items not included in bound report.

FACILITIES

*Higher Education Facilities Classification and Inventory
Procedures - Manual (102 pages)

**Physical Facility and Utilization Services (115 pages)

**Chart 2 - From need to Facility in Wisconsin (3 pages)

*Laboratory Space Factors Used For Projecting the 1969-71
Needs in Wisconsin Public Higher Education Facilities (3 pages)

*Items not included in bound report

**Items not included in bound report

FACULTY LOAD STUDIES

Selected Bibliography on Faculty Load Studies (6 pages)

Exercises for Faculty Load Study (3 pages)

Project Numbers 1 through 5 with accompanying materials (7 pages)

A Selected Bibliography on

FACULTY LOAD STUDIES

by

John E. Stecklein

Bolton, Dale L. "Measuring Faculty Load," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 13, (S, 1965), pp. 157-8.

Two purposes of measuring faculty load: (1) to acquire adequate faculty, and (2) to divide responsibility among faculty. Certain assumptions regarding faculty load are discussed, e.g., some college tasks are "required," "expected," or "desired." Three major problems are delineated: (1) interaction between administration and department; (2) How is professor's role agreed upon?; (3) criteria of faculty load.

Major factors in measuring faculty load; contact hours, student advisees, committee memberships, administrative duties, service activities, research and scholarly tasks. Suggestions are made as to the implementation of faculty load by both department, instructor, and administration.

Bunnell, Kevin (ed.) Faculty Work Load: A Conference Report, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Report of a conference sponsored by Southern Regional Education Board, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, New England Board of Higher Education, and the Office of Statistical Information and Research of the American Council on Education. Its contents include: (1) an overview which suggests the importance of faculty work load studies, discusses the sociology of faculty work load, and attempts to define the term, (2) three reports concerned with the methods and techniques for measuring faculty work load, (3) three reports on the uses of faculty work load data, (4) a discussion of the dynamics of faculty load studies, and (5) a survey of the literature concerning faculty load, together with a bibliography.

California and Western Conference Cost and Statistical Study, "Instruction,"
Fund for the Advancement of Education, Chapter II, pp. 9-31, 1960.

Probably the most comprehensive study on the internal affairs of each of the cooperating institutions. Data for Chapter II were tabulated by institutions by subject fields and according to lower,

upper, and graduate levels of instruction, FTE teaching staff by levels of instruction, FTE teaching staff by methods of instruction, relationship between unit teaching costs and teaching assignments by selected subject fields, teaching-salary expenditures by levels of instruction, etc. Two measures of teaching costs were used in the study: teaching-salary expenditure for weekly student-class-hour and teaching-salary expenditure per student credit hour.

Also included is a table showing distribution of faculty time among all functions, such as, all teaching, departmental research, departmental administration, public and professional services, etc.

Drews, Theodore H. The Professional Activities of the Teaching Staff, Fall Term, 1964-65, Office of Institutional Research, University of Michigan, October, 1965, p. 55.

Description of methods used and results of a faculty load study, with analyses of all activities, by college, rank, and budgetary support. Also data on total costs of activities, by rank and college.

Eckert, Ruth E. "The University Faculty Load Study," Studies in Higher Education, Biennial Report of the Committee on Educational Research, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1942, pp. 1-31.

Report of an extensive study of faculty load at the University of Minnesota. A five-page questionnaire was filled out by each faculty member at the end of each quarter (text of questionnaire included). This questionnaire included data on teaching load by number of courses taught, number of credit hours taught, number of students per course, level of courses taught, number of classroom hours, and hours of preparation. Also included in the questionnaire were time spent in individual counseling; number of other campus activities, and time spent; number of research projects and time spent; number of off-campus related activities and time spent; membership in professional organizations and time spent.

The data were analyzed by total time spent by each person, and by time spent in each of the separate activities, by college, department, academic rank, time of year, etc.

Jackson, Melbourne L. "A Survey of Faculty Teaching Loads in Chemical Engineering," Journal of Engineering Education, 41: 552-554, May, 1951.

Based upon questionnaire returns from 86 institutions which offer curriculums in chemical engineering. Tabulates teaching loads for various types of institutions and also distribution of student-staff ratios.

Keller, Robert J. and Abernathy, Margaret G. The 1950-51 Survey of Faculty Activities at the University of Minnesota, Bureau of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1951.

A comprehensive summary of the services of 1299 full-time faculty members of University of Minnesota during Fall Quarter, 1950 and supplemented by sampling surveys during the Winter and Spring of 1951. Time in hours per week was used in estimating faculty load. Kinds of activities by faculty considered in the study included the following: classroom teaching, non-scheduled and individualized instruction, counseling, and advising, research, administrative responsibilities, committee work, consultative services, and others. Analysis was made by rank and by college.

Knowles, Asa S. and White, W. C. "Evaluation of Faculty Loads in Institutions of Higher Learning," Journal of Engineering Education, 29: 798-810; 1939.

The authors propose that "education take a lesson from industry in this matter of evaluating the teaching job by attacking the problems of faculty loads with the tools of modern management rather than in terms of traditional educational terminology. Specifically they suggest that if an evaluation of faculty service load is to be meaningful it must be based upon a separate analysis of the various components which taken together comprise the work done by a faculty member."

Messick, John D. "Teaching and Service Loads of College and University Staffs," School and Society, LXIX (May 7, 1949), pp. 335-36.

Replies to a questionnaire concerning faculty service loads were received from 40 arts and science colleges and 15 teachers colleges in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The seven items were: (1) How much service, or time, should a college expect of a staff member? (2) What is considered a teaching load? (3) Does size of class have influence on service load? (4) Are extra class activities, such as membership on committees, advisers, directors of activities, and conference periods counted as service loads? (5) How are service loads of supervisory and administrative personnel determined? (6) How many weeks are counted in service load for faculty? (7) To what extent should persons be paid additional salary for extra required service?

Randolph, Victor. "The Professor's Weekly Work Hours," School and Society, LXXII (September 23, 1950), pp. 201-02.

Report of a study of the average number of hours per week spent by a sample of 75 Southern Illinois University faculty members on 12

different kinds of activities. The activities listed, together with average hours per person per week, were: Hours in class, 14.6; Preparation for class, 12.2; Conferences with students, 4.4; Faculty meetings and committee work, 2.2; Office work, 4.6; Oral exams, 0.2; Research, 4.9; Field work and public relations, 0.9; Travel to extension classes, 0.5; Professional reading, 3.2; Attending regional meetings, 0.0; and other 3.9. The average total number of hours per person per week was 51.6.

Richards, C.F. "Toward the Equalization of Teaching-Loads," Journal of Higher Education, XXI (January, 1950), pp. 39-41.

Discusses the kinds of factors which cause variation in actual teaching loads among faculty members and brings out some of the difficulties involved in measuring them. Reviews the 1937 Haggerty study of teaching loads in 57 representative North Central institutions and suggests that a more accurate measure of teaching loads than is supplied by either credit-hours or contact-hours might be the ratio of out-of-class work to clock or contact-hours.

Russell, John Dale, Director (Office of Institutional Research, New York University, Washington Square, New York, New York), Report on Current Institutional Research, Office of Statistical Information and Research, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., No. 6, July 16, 1958.

A complete analysis of the instructional program of New York University covering the academic year 1957-58. The study examines such phases of the program as the scope of course offerings, the size of classes, the teaching loads of faculty members, the student credit-hour production, and the instructional salary costs.

Silvey, H. M. "Instructional Load -- A Cooperative Survey of Instructional Load in 39 Midwest Colleges in Eleven States," Bureau of Research and Examination Services, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa, 1959.

A report of a cooperative study of instructional load in 39 teachers colleges or former teachers colleges in 11 Midwestern states.

Instructional activities were interpreted as those which involved direct instructional contact with the student, and administrative and other non-instructional duties were not included. The study serves the following purposes: (a) it provides a broad overview of instructional loads commonly quantified and more or less systematically recorded in the records of the institution, (b) it provides the administrator and the instructor with specific information about the quantitative aspects of instructional load so that the more intangible elements of the service load can be better considered in the total load picture, and (c) it provides concrete information and incentive for institutional self-study and appraisal. A sequel was conducted, based on the Fall Term of 1961, as reported in Cooperative Research: Instructional Load, 1961.

Supplemental Bibliography

American Association of University Professors Committee on College and University Teaching. "Statement on Faculty Workload," AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 52, (D, 1966), pp. 385-6.

In response to the many appeals received in recent years, the Association set forth guidelines (faculty load) that can be applied generally regardless of the institution concerned: (1) a definition of maximum teaching load for effective instruction at the undergraduate and graduate level, (2) a description of the procedures that should be followed in establishing, administering, and revising workload policies, (3) an identification of the most common sources of inequity in the distribution of workloads.

Bagley, Clarence H. (ed.) "Faculty Load Studies," Design and Method in Institutional Research, State University of New York, at Stony Brook, May 3-4, 1965 pp. 1-5.

Describes briefly some basic concepts in approaching faculty load studies and illustrate how one institution (University of Maryland) has devised a method of making instructional load comparison.

Coffelt, John J. Faculty Teaching Load and Student Credit Hour Costs in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education, 1964-65, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Box 53383, State Capitol Station, Oklahoma City, Okla., 1966, 109 pp.

This report is the fourth annual study of faculty teaching loads and student-credit-hour cost at institutions in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education. It is designed to serve two Purposes: (1) to provide the State Regents with faculty load and educational program data that are helpful in statewide planning and coordination; and (2) to provide governing boards, college and administrators and faculties with objective data of value in assessing the general efficiency of institutional operation, planning future expansion of programs, and determining staffing pattern needs.

Hobbs, M.T. "Teaching Loads in Selected Liberal Arts Colleges,"
Liberal Education, Vol. 52, 1966, pp. 418-21. Washington
D.C. Association of American Colleges, Inc.

Report of a questionnaire study of twenty-five first rate liberal arts colleges. The questionnaire dealt with that part of the total faculty workload that is easily measured; the number of hours spent in classroom instruction. Other factors taken in consideration in evaluation: class size, amount of time devoted to preparation, laboratory supervision, student conferences, committee work, and other special assignments (as in music and physical education) to research and research supervision, to administrative duties and to consultation.

Information was collected on maximum teaching load according to college policy, average actual teaching load, percentage of teachers carrying loads at the extremes of the distributions, the average number of preparations and adjustment to load for research and administrative duties.

Stecklein, John E. "How to Measure Faculty Work Load," American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1961.

John E. Stecklein

EXERCISES FOR FACULTY LOAD STUDY

Midwest Workshop on Institutional Research

June, 1968

Project No.1: Design a Faculty Load Study for Your Home Institution

Part A: Establish the framework.

Use and answer the following questions as guides in designing your study:

1. Why is the study being made?
2. Who are the "faculty"?
3. What do you mean by "load"? What activities are included?
In which activities are you most interested? In what
amount of detail?
4. How should the information be collected?
5. What time span should be involved?
6. How will the results be reported, and to whom?
7. How might the data be used?

Part B: Define the load categories to be used.

Part C: Sketch out the form you will use to collect the data.

John E. Strecklein

EXERCISES FOR FACULTY LOAD STUDY

Midwest Workshop on Institutional Research

June, 1968

Project No. 2: The Analysis of Faculty Load Data

Work independently on items 1-4, then collaborate with your partner(s) on Items 6-8

1. Make ten copies of your Faculty Load Forms
2. On the forms fill in data as you think various members of your faculty might do it; be sure to include data for as many types of faculty as possible that are to be included in your study; i.e., part-time, administrators, library staff, teaching assistants, etc.
3. Set up tables to summarize and analyze the data:
 - (a) A table to provide an over-view of the findings
 - (b) Table(s) to provide detailed comparisons, e.g., by rank, by subject field, by course level, by sex, by type of instruction, etc.
4. What one or two summary statistics would you use to describe the work-load of the faculty?
5. How well does the functional emphasis of the faculty represent the professed functional emphasis of the institution (or department)?
6. Compare your work-load statistics with those of your partner(s).
 - (a) Which hypothetical faculty is working more?
 - (b) How do their functional emphases compare?
 - (c) Do you think a comparison of this kind is meaningful? Useful? If not, what could you do to make it so? If so, how do you think the comparison could be made meaningful or useful?
7. Would you present your findings to the faculty? If so, how? If not, why not?
8. How would you present the findings to the president, vice-president or dean?

John E. Stecklein

EXERCISES FOR FACULTY LOAD STUDY

Midwest Workshop on Institutional Research

June, 1968

Project No. 3: Cost Analysis Based on Faculty Load Data

1. Assign each of the ten (10) faculty members a hypothetical (but realistic) salary. Indicate whether they are twelve (12) month or nine (9) month salaries.
2. Using the course data and faculty load data provided (obtained from actual load studies), set up tables to demonstrate the following:
 - (a) Credit-hour loads, student-credit-hour loads, and student-class-hour loads by faculty rank.
 - (b) F.T.E. faculty devoted to the various levels of instruction.
 - (c) The gross salary costs of instruction at the various levels of instruction.
 - (d) The unit costs of instruction per credit-hour, student-credit-hour, and student-class-hour:
 - i. by level of instruction
 - ii. by type of instruction
 - iii. by subject field
3. If we assume that full-time teaching loads in the institution are 12, 10, 8, and 6 hours for instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors, respectively, calculate the unit costs (per credit-hour and per student-class-hour) for each level of instruction and subject field.
4. Are the unit costs computed in the two different ways similar? If not, what accounts for the difference?
5. What factors influence the unit costs? How could the highest costs be reduced?

John E. Stecklein

Midwest Workshop on Institutional Research

June, 1968

Project No. 4: Faculty Characteristics Analysis

The Vice-president (Dean) of your institution tells you that he is concerned about the quality of the faculty. He would like you to collect information that would be useful to him in judging the quality of the faculty and whether or not the quality is improving or lessening. He also indicates that he is becoming concerned about the high degree of inbreeding in some parts of the faculty, and thinks that such inbreeding is bad. He would like data to support his contention.

1. What criteria of quality would you use (available from existing records)?
2. What criteria of quality would you collect that are not currently available?
3. How would you study the quality trend?
4. How would you define the faculty?
5. How would you define inbreeding?
6. How would you determine the "effect" of inbreeding from the data on quality? Would you attempt to do what the vice-president suggested concerning inbreeding? Is it possible to prove that inbreeding is good or bad from the analysis of objective data?
7. What other ways could you tackle the inbreeding question?
8. What kinds of data on faculty characteristics should be kept routinely for ready analysis?

John E. Stecklein

Midwest Workshop on Institutional Research

June 1968

Project No. 5: Student Rating of Faculty

As Institutional Research director, you have been asked to work with a student faculty committee to develop a form which students can use to evaluate their course instructors. Although the faculty have expressed no great interest in the action, they have endorsed the committee's work which was brought about by student pressure. Proposed guidelines require techniques to preserve the anonymity of the student-evaluators, ease of reporting and scoring, and a simple summary report to each faculty member.

1. What aspects of a course should be evaluated?
2. What aspects of an instruction should be evaluated? Should students be given the opportunity to react to personal mannerisms of the teacher?
3. Rough out 5 or 6 questions that will deal with the course, the faculty, and the instruction.
4. Would you encourage the committee to publish the results of the ratings, as the students prefer?
5. What philosophy lies behind your recommendation on item 4?
6. Sketch out a procedure for reporting results back to the faculty.

Sample Faculty Instructional Load Data

Midwest Workshop on I.R.

Dept.	Type of Inst'n	No. of Studs	Cr.	Class Hours	Level of Inst'n	Per Cent of Time	Total Rank (% Time)	Salary
Physics	1	19	3	3	3	50	Inst.(100)	7,000
Physics 11	1	220	3	3	1	40		
Physics	1	165	3	3	1	30	Ass't P.(100)	12,800
Physics 11	1	278	3	3	1	35		
Physics 14	6	--	--	--	3	10		
Physics	1	66	3	3	2	10	Asso. P.(50)	8,700
Physics	6	--	--	--	3	8		
Physics	1	7	3	3	3	35	Prof. (100)	21,000
Physics 11	1	10	3	3	3	35		
Physics 14	6	--	--	--	3	8		
Philosophy	1	55	3	3	1	25	Instr.(100)	8,000
Philosophy	1	10	3	3	3	20		
Philosophy	1	23	3	3	2	20		
Philosophy	6	--	--	--	3	2		
Philosophy	1	15	3	3	2	20	Ass't P.(100)	
Philosophy	1	7	3	3	2	20		10,000
Philosophy	1	7	5	5	2	33		
Philosophy	1	21	3	3	3	15	Assoc. P.(100)	
Philosophy	1	10	3	3	3	25		12,000
Philosophy	4	4	3	2	3	15		
Philosophy	6	--	--	--	3	5		
Philosophy	3	10	3	1	2	10*		
Philosophy	3	16	3	3	3	40	Prof. (100)	16,000
Philosophy	3	13	3	3	3	12*		
Philosophy	4	1	3	1	3	5		
Philosophy	6	--	--	--	3	5		

*Taught jointly with

*Another staff member

Derivation of Unit Costs from Faculty Load Data - Midwest Workshop on I.R.

	Student Class	Cr.	SCH	Hours	F.T.E. at course level			Total Salary/quarter	Proportion of Salary by level		
					1	2	3		1	2	3
Professor											
Physics		6	51	51			.78	7,000			
Philosophy		12	120	98		.10	.62	5,333			
Course Level		Cr.	St.	SCH	F.T.E. Salary			Cost	Cr.	Cost	Cost
								St.	SCH	FTE	
1.		3	220	660	.4	7,000/3	\$ 935	\$312	4.26	1.42	
		3	165	495	.3	12,800/3	\$1,280	417	7.78	2.59	
		3	278	834	.35	12,800/3	\$1,495	498	5.38	1.79	
Total		9	663	1,989	1.05		\$3,710	412	5.62	1.87	3,540
2.		3	66	198	.10	15,400/3	\$ 513	171	7.80	2.60	F.T.E.
3.		3	19	57	.50	7,000/3	\$1,167	389	61.60	20.50	
		3	7	21	.35	21,000/3	\$2,450	817	350.00	116.67	
		3	10	30	.35	21,000/3	\$2,450	817	245.00	81.70	
		--	--	--	.10	12,800/3	\$ 427	--	--	--	
		--	--	--	.08	15,400/3	\$ 410	--	--	--	
		--	--	--	.08	21,000/3	\$ 560	--	--	--	
					1.46		\$7,464	--	--	--	\$5,120
Philosophy 1.		3	55	165	.25	8,000/3	\$ 667	223	12.12	4.05	
2.		3	23	69	.20	8,000/3	\$ 533	178	23.20	7.73	
		3	15	45	.20	10,000/3	\$ 667	222	44.40	14.80	
		3	7	21	.20	10,000/3	\$ 667	222	95.50	31.83	
		5	7	35	.33	10,000/3	\$1,100	220	157.00	31.40	
		3	10	30	.10*	16,000/3	\$ 553	178	53.50	17.77	
3.		3	10	30	.20	8,000/3	\$ 533	178	53.30	17.77	
		3	21	63	.15	12,000/3	\$ 600	200	28.60	9.53	

* Instruction shared with other instructors.

Sample Total Faculty Load Data

Midwest Workshop on I.R.

		Instructor									
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Instruction	1.	25	12	--	40	--	93	67	47	85	60
	2.	20	28	87	--	69	--	--	--	--	--
	3.	22	28	--	50	13	--	--	--	--	30
	4.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	5.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Instruction Sub-Total		67	68	87	90	82	93	67	47	85	90
Departmental Research		25	25	10	10	5	--	--	--	--	--
Departmental Admin.		--	2	--	--	3	4	--	--	7	--
Professional Services		--	--	--	--	5	--	--	--	3	--
Organized Research		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Library		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
General Administration		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ag Extension		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Student Services		8	5	3	--	5	3	--	3	5	10
Auxiliary Extension		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total Per Cent		100	100	100	100	100	100	67	50	100	100
		Gen'l									
Hours/wk		Phil 60	Bot 50	Engl 60	Physics 55	Geog 48	Engl 45	Studies 27	Psych 20	Fren 50	Psych 58
		Assistant Professor									
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Instruction	1.	--	49	55	--	75	--	65	35	--	--
	2.	100	--	--	73	--	--	--	55	--	95
	3.	--	5	35	--	--	50	10	--	--	--
	4.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	5.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Sub Total		100	54	90	73	75	50	75	90	0	95
Departmental Research		--	25	--	15	5	--	--	10	50	--
Departmental Admin.		--	6	--	7	--	3	10	--	--	--
Professional Services		--	10	--	5	5	2	--	--	--	--
Organized Research		--	--	--	--	--	--	10	--	--	--
Library		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
General Administration		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ag Extension		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Student Services		--	5	10	--	5	--	5	--	--	5
Auxiliary Extension		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total Per Cent		100	100	100	100	90	55	100	100	50	100
		Gen'l									
Hours/wk		Engl.	Bot.	Math	Span.	Classics	Soc.	Physics	Geol.	Stud.	Engl.

FACULTY ACTIVITY STUDY

Fall 1966														
Per Cent Time Spent on Activity, By Rank	Instruc- tion		Grad. Advising		Research		Other Scholarly Activities		External Prof'l Services		Internal Prof'l Services		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professor														
(N=43)														
Per Cent														
0	7	16.3	5	11.6	16	37.2	6	14.0	7	16.3	2	4.6	40	93.0
1-5	1	2.3	6	14.0	6	14.0	13	30.2	21	48.8	1	2.3	2	4.6
6-10	4	9.3	11	25.6	7	16.3	8	18.6	5	11.6	3	7.0	1	2.3
11-20	8	18.6	15	34.9	4	9.3	11	25.6	8	18.6	15	34.9	--	
21-50	19	44.2	6	14.0	8	18.6	4	9.3	1	2.3	18	41.9	--	
51-80	4	9.3	--		2	4.6	1	2.3	1	2.3	3	7.0	--	
81-100	--		--		--		--		--		1	2.3	--	
Total	43	100.0	43	100.0	43	100.0	43	100.0	43	100.0	43	100.0	43	100.0
Associate Professor														
(N=24)														
Per Cent														
0	--		3	12.5	8	33.3	3	12.5	1	4.2	--		22	91.7
1-5	1	4.2	4	16.7	6	25.0	10	41.7	13	54.2	2	8.4	1	4.2
6-10	1	4.2	5	20.8	5	20.8	2	8.4	7	29.2	6	25.0	1	4.2
11-20	3	12.5	8	33.3	2	8.4	5	20.8	2	8.4	8	33.3	--	
21-50	12	50.0	4	16.7	2	8.4	4	16.7	--		7	29.2	--	
51-80	7	29.2	--		1	4.2	--		1	4.2	1	4.2	--	
81-100	--		--		--		--		--		--		--	
Total	24	100.0	24	100.0	24	100.0	24	100.0	24	100.0	24	100.0	24	100.0
Assistant Professor														
(N=31)														
Per Cent														
0	1	3.2	10	32.3	12	38.7	6	19.4	13	41.9	2	6.4	27	87.1
1-5	--		11	35.5	6	19.4	5	16.1	11	35.5	5	16.1	1	3.2
6-10	1	3.2	6	19.4	2	6.4	5	16.1	6	19.4	9	29.0	1	3.2
11-20	3	9.7	4	12.9	--		9	29.0	1	3.2	5	16.1	--	
21-50	17	54.8	--		10	32.3	5	16.1	--		10	32.3	2	6.4
51-80	5	16.1	--		1	3.2	1	3.2	--		--		--	
81-100	4	12.9	--		--		--		--		--		--	
Total	31	100.0	31	100.0	31	100.0	31	100.0	31	100.0	31	100.0	31	100.0
All Ranks														
(N=98)														
Per Cent														
0	8	8.2	18	18.4	36	36.7	15	15.3	21	21.4	4	4.1	89	90.8
1-5	2	2.0	21	21.4	18	18.4	28	28.6	45	45.9	8	8.2	4	4.1
6-10	6	6.1	22	22.4	14	14.3	15	15.3	18	18.4	18	18.4	3	3.1
11-20	14	14.3	27	27.6	6	6.1	25	25.5	11	11.2	28	28.6	--	
21-50	48	49.0	10	10.2	20	20.4	13	13.3	1	1.0	35	35.7	2	2.0
51-80	16	16.3	--		4	4.1	2	2.0	2	2.0	4	4.1	--	
81-100	4	4.1	--		0		--		--		1	1.0	--	
Total	98	100.0	98	100.0	98	100.0	98	100.0	98	100.0	98	100.0	98	100.0

FACULTY ACTIVITY STUDY

Type of Activity	Assistant Professor								
	Fall, 1966 (N=31)			Winter, 1966 (N=31)			Spring, 1967 (N=31)		
	No.of Hours	Mean Hours	Per Cent	No.of Hours	Mean Hours	Per Cent	No.of Hours	Mean Hours	Per Cent
Instruction	823.3	26.61	48.1	915.6	29.5	51.9	770.5	24.9	45.4
Graduate Advising	91.2	2.9	5.2	89.4	2.9	5.1	102.6	3.3	6.0
Doctoral Candidates	18.9		1.1	24.4		1.4	29.4		.7
Masters Candidates	72.3		4.2	65.0		3.7	73.2		4.3
Research	241.5	7.8	14.1	239.3	7.7	13.5	238.3	7.7	14.0
Other Scholarly									
Activities	218.37	7.0	12.6	203.7	6.6	11.6	227.0	7.3	13.3
Proj. Dev.	54.27		3.2	51.9		2.9	73.4		4.3
Cur. Dev.	43.5		2.5	34.3		1.9	26.5		1.5
Creative Works	5.8		.3	4.2		.2	4.2		.2
Sp. Training Proj.	46.4		2.7	50.4		2.9	53.0		3.1
Writing, pub., editing, etc.	47.3		2.7	43.5		2.5	53.6		3.1
Other	21.1		1.2	19.4		1.1	16.3		.9
External Prof'l Services	48.4	1.6	2.9	49.3	1.6	2.8	49.3	1.6	2.9
Prof'l or Com. Org.	25.3		1.5	28.1		1.6	26.6		1.6
Gov't Agencies	7.4		.4	8.5		.5	9.4		.5
Off-Campus Groups etc.	12.0		.7	8.5		.5	10.8		.6
Other	3.7		.2	4.2		.2	2.5		.1
Internal Prof'l									
Services	247.04	8.0	14.4	231.3	7.5	13.2	232.2	7.5	13.7
Consulting with Staff	40.2		2.3	32.5		1.8	37.0		2.2
Committee Activities	74.27		4.3	73.7		4.2	73.3		4.3
Adm. Duties	40.57		2.4	39.5		2.2	38.2		2.2
Stud. Counselling etc.	90.2		5.2	83.4		4.7	81.9		4.8
Other	1.8		.1	2.2		.1	1.8		.1
Other	46.1	1.5	2.7	31.7	1.0	1.8	79.9	2.6	4.7
Total	1,715.9	55.4	100.0	1,760.3	56.8	100.0	1,699.8	54.8	100.0

INTEGRATED DATA SYSTEMS

Integrated Data System

Exercise I "A Fact Book" (1 page)

*Integrated Data System (8 pages)

*Motivation for a Data System (10 pages)

Exercise II Data Reporting, (1 page)

*A paper by L. J. Lins (21 pages)

Exercise III A Conceptual Approach Data Collection, Input and
Output (1 page)

*A paper by L. J. Lins and accompanying materials (16 pages)

Exercise IV - Questionnaires (1 page)

*Guidelines for Responding to Questionnaires (2 pages)

*Definitions of Full-Time and Full-Time Equivalent (F.T.E.)
Students in Use by the University of Wisconsin (3 pages)

*Sample U.S. Office of Education Questionnaires

*Resource Materials for Sessions, Dealing With Data Systems:
Design and Utilization (30 pages)

*Items not included in bound report.

L. J. Lins
Midwest Workshop on
Institutional Research
June 23 - July 3, 1968

INTEGRATED DATA SYSTEMS - EXERCISE I

Integrated Data System - A "Fact Book"

Following an overview of "Integrated Data Systems", I have distributed four separate and relevant papers; these are:

1. "Motivation for a Data System"
2. "Outline of Basic Institutional Data"
3. "Outline for an Information System for University Management"
4. "Areas for Institutional Research"

Exercise

1. Set up a system of categories for which uniform data should be collected for your institution based upon the information needs of the institution.
2. Set up the sub-categories under each major category.
3. Determine the range of years for which data are necessary to meet the data needs of your institution.

Integrated Data Systems - Data Reporting

1. For the following data, draw a simple bar graph and a plane graph to correctly represent the data.

Enrollment in First Grade In schools A, B, C, and D	
<u>School</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>
A	4
B	8
C	16
D	36

2. Cross out the incorrect words in parentheses in the following statements: (See Graph V, last page of report)

a. (See line A) If a variable is increased by a (variable, constant) amount over time, it is (increasing, decreasing) at (a, an) (increasing, decreasing) rate. This would appear as a line convex upward on a semilogarithmic graph but as a straight line with an upward slope on a rectilinear coordinate graph.

b. (See line B) If a variable is (decreased, increased) at a constant rate over time, it is increasing by (a, an) (decreasing, increasing) amount. This would appear as a straight line with an upward slope on a semilogarithmic graph but as a line concave upward on a rectilinear coordinate graph.

c. (See line C) If a variable is (increased, decreased) by a constant amount over time, it is (increasing, decreasing) at (a, an) (increasing, decreasing) rate. This would appear as a line convex downward on a semilogarithmic graph but as a straight line with a downward slope on a rectilinear coordinate graph.

d. (See line D) If a variable is (increased, decreased) at a constant rate over time, it is (increasing, decreasing) by (a, an) (increasing, decreasing) amount. This would appear as a straight line with a downward slope on a semilogarithmic graph but as a line concave downward on a rectilinear coordinate graph.

e. (See line E) If a variable is (both, neither) increasing (nor, and) decreasing in amount or in rate over time, it would appear as a straight horizontal line on both the semilogarithmic and rectilinear graphs.

f. If a variable is (increased, decreased) at (a, an) (increasing, decreasing) rate over time, it is (increasing, decreasing) by (a, an) (increasing, decreasing) amount. The line on both the semilogarithmic graph and the rectilinear graph would be concave downward.

L. J. Lins
Midwest Workshop on
Institutional Research
June 23 - July 3, 1968

INTEGRATED DATA SYSTEMS - EXERCISE III

Integrated Data Systems -- A Conceptual Approach Data Collection, Input, and Output

1. How can all appropriate offices of your institution be motivated to actively cooperate and participate in a conceptual integrated data system?
2. How would you go about developing the integrated data system for your institution for an area of endeavor for which you are most closely involved -- faculty, students, budgets, academic? (Each group -- table -- select one of the four areas of faculty, students, budgets, or academic and answer the question for that area)
3. Develop a diagrammatic flow of data for your system for the area selected in 2 above. (Each group -- table -- work jointly on this)

L. J. Lins
Midwest Workshop on
Institutional Research
June 23 - July 3, 1968

INTEGRATED DATA SYSTEMS - EXERCISE IV

Integrated Data Systems -- Questionnaires

No exercises will be completed by the participants during this unit. Rather the period will be devoted to lecture and discussion including questions and answers and interaction of the group. the session will consist of:

1. A lecture on "The Integrated Data System and its Relationship to Questionnaires".
2. A discussion of "Guidelines for Responding to Questionnaires".
3. A discussion of "Definitions of Full-time Equivalent (F.T.E) Students in Use by The University of Wisconsin".
4. Discussion of the entire 1968 HEGIS (Higher Education General Information Survey) questionnaires.

MISCELLANEOUS PAPERS PROVIDED OR DISTRIBUTED
BY GUEST LECTURERS

- *Anticipation of Research Needs: Implications for Institutional Research (2 pages)
- *College Research Center - Form B (Student Roster) Sample (1 page)
- *Computer sample NSF Inventory of Computers, Applications of Computers, and Instructional Programs in U.S. Higher Education (5 pages)
- *Level of Data Processing, Statistical, and Computing Techniques Useful in Institutional Research (4 pages)
- **Selected Bibliography on State-Level Coordination and Planning (2 pages)
- *An Appraisal and Projection - paper delivered by Dr. Ruth E. Eckert (13 pages)
- *Space Guidelines for Physical Education (4 pages)

*Items not included in bound report.

**Items not included in bound report.

Financial Summary -- (Note: This summary does not serve as a final financial report so amounts are not completely exact.)

	<u>Budgeted</u>	<u>Expanded or Committed</u>
Salaries:		
Director	4,600	4,600
Professional Staff	3,600	3,000
Special Lecturer	800	600
Secretarial	500	500
Supplies:	400	400
Travel:		
Director	500	400
Professional Staff	1,600*	1,700
Special Lecturer	928*	345
Other Direct Costs:		
Director--Per Diem	416	416
Generalist--Per Diem	416	385
Indirect Costs:	<u>1,099.</u>	<u>1,099</u>
Total	14,839	13,445

*Includes Per Diem allowances.